

2342

"A second requirement concerns a change in the criteria for granting aid. U.S. foreign aid policy is a branch of U.S. foreign policy, which should be directed toward achieving specific foreign policy goals. By and large it has not been effectively used for this purpose in Latin America. In its simplest terms, our goal in Latin America should be to help nations of the area grow economically while they retain internal political freedom, and thus remain part of the Western community of nations. Without economic growth the other goals will be much more difficult—if not impossible—to achieve. In order to get growth—which comes first both in time and in relation to goals involving redistribution of income—capital is needed. Most of this must come from internal sources. Thus, foreign aid should be used as an inducement to nations to adopt policies which will improve the business climate and thereby increase domestic savings and investments. The United States should concentrate its economic aid program in countries that show the greatest inclination to adopt measures to improve the investment climate, and withhold aid from others until satisfactory performance has been demonstrated.

"The extent to which this policy would differ from the present one in Latin America can be seen by indicating what it would not involve:

"1. Unless there are overpowering political considerations, the United States would not lend money or make grants in countries which persist in policies which discourage private investment.

"2. The United States would not grant balance-of-payments loans of the bail-out variety though it should cooperate with the IMF on constructive balance-of-payments loans and stabilization programs.

"3. The United States would not provide foreign aid in such a way as to finance the expropriation of privately owned companies in any field of endeavor.

"On the positive side, the United States would seek opportunities to get individual countries started toward rapid growth. Assistance on a relatively large scale would be focused in a few countries that appeared most likely to carry out measures needed to encourage investments and establish the widest area of economic freedom.

"Nowhere in the whole broad range of current economic problems is there one more compellingly significant for the United States than that of supporting the economic and social advance of our neighbors to the South.

"We are persuaded that the most important way in which the United States can help is by exporting the ideas implicit in a free economy. Certainly, money or goods alone will not do the job. Free enterprise is the basis of our own growth, and it provided the framework on which our social and political institutions, imperfect as they still are, have evolved. We feel certain that free enterprise can be the basis of growth in Latin America—indeed, that there is no known alternative that still permits a substantial measure of individual freedom.

"We also believe, however, that to encourage such an evolution in Latin America the United States must change its role—from one that emphasizes short run economic palliatives combined with recommendations for sweeping social and economic reforms to one that places the greatest emphasis on the longer-run goals of creating an environment in which freedom of the

marketplace is recognized for what it is, a major pillar of free and prosperous societies.

"EMILIO G. COLLADO,
"Vice President and Director,
"Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.
"DAVID ROCKEFELLER,
"President,
"The Chase Manhattan Bank.
"WALTER B. WRISTON,
"Executive Vice President,
"First National City Bank."

THE CUBAN QUESTION

(Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. BRUCE) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, because of its importance I am today placing in the RECORD a column by Walter Lippmann entitled "On the Cuban Question Today." In the column Mr. Lippmann puts down his reasons for believing that our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New York, Senator KEATING, has won the right to be listened to. Mr. Lippmann states in his article that after too long a delay the administration finally did what it should have done in the beginning, which was to arrange for consultation and an exchange of information between Senator KEATING and the CIA. Mr. Lippmann goes on and states that no matter what the consultation and exchange lead to he is not sure it will repair altogether the damage done to public confidence by the misleading information given out—the administration—in September and October.

The administration may well have also to make a full explanation of what went wrong in September and early October—

States Mr. Lippmann.

Mr. Lippmann's article is timely and I commend it to the attention of the Members of the House and Senate:

ON THE CUBAN QUESTION TODAY
(By Walter Lippmann)

In the past week the administration has gone to extraordinary lengths to win the country's confidence in the reliability of its information about the military situation in Cuba. Since the October confrontation there can, of course, be no lack of confidence in the President's courage and determination to protect American interests once the facts of a threat are established.

The crisis of confidence originates in what happened in the 6 weeks before the October confrontation. During the month of September and into October the administration was insisting that the Soviet Union had not brought offensive weapons into Cuba. Senator KEATING was insisting that they had. When he was found to have been right, there occurred a loss of confidence in the administration's intelligence services which it is still struggling to repair.

With others, I have had firsthand experience which enables me to understand how difficult it is to restore confidence once it has been shaken. On two occasions it was explained to me by high officials how reliable was our photographic surveillance of the island, and how certainly we could detect the exact nature of the weapons being

installed in Cuba. These private extensions came after the President had categorically in his press conference of October 13 that "these new shipments do constitute a serious threat to any other of the hemisphere." Some 2 weeks later, October 3, the Under Secretary of State, Ball, gave to a congressional committee summary of the intelligence information which came from the CIA. The point of summary was that there were no offensive weapons in Cuba.

But in fact there were. A week later, October 10, Senator KEATING insisted that there were intermediate range missiles in Cuba, and 5 days later the President received the photographs which confirmed the charge.

This is how Senator KEATING won the right to be listened to, and this is why the administration has now, belatedly, made the right move, which is to arrange for consultation and an exchange of information between Senator KEATING and the CIA.

This should put an end to the unseemly controversy about who is telling the truth between a Senator of the United States and the President of the United States. But I am not sure it will repair altogether the damage done to public confidence by the misleading information given out in September and October. The administration may well have also to make a full explanation of what went wrong in September and early October.

Examining the remarkable intelligence briefing by Mr. John Hughes of the Defense Department, I find myself quite convinced that our photographic intelligence is now reliable. But I am struck by the fact that there was a blank space in Mr. Hughes' testimony for the period from September 5 to October 14.

Photographs taken on August 29 of the San Cristobal area and on September 5 at Sagua la Grande show positively that no missile sites had been built. The next photograph referred to by Mr. Hughes is that of October 14. It shows intermediate range missile sites being erected. This is the photograph which precipitated the international crisis.

Where, we are bound to ask, was our photographic intelligence between September 5 and October 14? That was when the administration was telling the country that there were no offensive weapons in Cuba. This is the source of the infection which will have to be removed if full confidence is to be restored.

Having said this, I would say that there is no reason to doubt the thoroughness or the reliability of our photographic surveillance of Cuba and of the sea around it. The situation is extraordinary. We are depending on being able to fly daily photographic reconnaissance planes at high and low altitude. In Cuba there are a large number of the latest antiaircraft weapons manned by Soviet soldiers.

We may say, how come? Up to the present—knock on wood—the Soviet antiaircraft gunners are not attacking our reconnaissance planes. They must be under orders from Moscow where it is well known that if the planes were attacked there would be an immediate reprisal.

But where does this leave us? It leaves us with a fragile revised version of the original Khrushchev-Kennedy agreement. In the key letter of October 27, President Kennedy accepted the following terms of settlement: The U.S.S.R. would remove offensive weapon systems under United Nations observation and supervision. When this was done, the United States would end the quarantine and

United States will be making a contribution to this project whether direct or indirect, and this is intolerable.

To grant any amount of aid to the Communist nation that has confiscated more than \$1 billion worth of American property and has not paid a cent in compensation is utterly unthinkable.

Mr. Speaker, while the subject of Cuba is under discussion, I wish to go on record as being in complete disagreement with the theory now apparently in vogue in administration circles that no one but the administration should discuss Cuba. In these days of managed news, I sincerely believe that it is the responsibility and duty of each citizen, and, particularly, each Member of Congress, to constructively discuss and, if necessary, as in this case, dare to criticize the decisions being made and carried out in our State Department by the administration. These men are not omniscient; their decisions are not sacrosanct.

This Nation is one of representative government, and as one Representative, I object to our financing anti-American policies. If this means that the Congress must cut off support for the Special Fund, then this must be done.

I have voiced my support of the United Nations in the past, as have the vast majority of Americans. However, this U.N. action demands a serious reappraisal of our role in the U.N. My deep concern has been voiced to the administration, and I sincerely hope that other Members of Congress will join in expressing their disapproval. Cuba today is a center for Communist subversive activities throughout the Western Hemisphere. Our every action must be to weaken communism in Cuba, not strengthen it.

A REAPPRAISAL OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. BRUCE) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the future of the Alliance for Progress. So far there has been very little progress, and too little leadership from the United States. The program cannot be allowed to continue to flounder. The future of the Western Hemisphere is at stake.

I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a memorandum prepared by three members of the Commerce Committee for the Alliance for Progress—COMAP: Emilio G. Collado, vice president and director, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; David Rockefeller, president, the Chase Manhattan Bank; and Walter B. Wriston, executive vice president, First National City Bank.

The authors call for a comprehensive reappraisal of the policies and actions that will help the Alliance for Progress to achieve its basic objectives. They urge that increased emphasis be placed on the "encouragement of private initiative and investment, both local and foreign." It is their further belief that:

The United States should concentrate its economic aid program in countries that show

the greatest inclination to adopt measures to improve the investment climate and withhold aid from others until satisfactory performance has been demonstrated.

This is an important study and I hope that it receives the widest possible attention.

The text of the statement follows:

A REAPPRAISAL OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Last spring, the Commerce Committee for the Alliance for Progress (COMAP) was launched with a view to seeking ways in which American business could further the Alliance. A few days ago, the Chairman of the Committee—J. Peter Grace—submitted a report to the Commerce Department and to other agencies, recommending certain legislative proposals relating to the Alliance. The following memorandum sets out the observations and conclusions of three members of COMAP who, while agreeing with many of the points made in the Grace report feel that there are certain aspects of the problem which need a somewhat different emphasis. For this reason we feel justified in submitting a separate commentary.

"We have become increasingly concerned lest the Alliance for Progress fail to achieve its objectives for lack of a proper focus for its activities.

"As one illustration, the initial concept of COMAP's role appears to have been directed at finding ways to meet the Punta del Este program of \$300 million a year of net new U.S. private investment in Latin America by devising short-range measures on the part of the United States to encourage such investment. If such measures would really get the Alliance off the ground, they might be justified. But we are disturbed by the feeling that even if such measures were taken, and were successful in inducing an expanded flow of U.S. investments into Latin America, the basic problem of making the area attractive to local savers and investors would remain. Indeed, such a program could do positive harm by making local governments feel even less urgency than they do now for achieving a proper investment climate.

"What is needed is a comprehensive reappraisal, not of the broad objectives of the Alliance for Progress, but of the policies and actions which will best achieve these objectives. The first year's operation of the Alliance saw heavy emphasis placed on government planning, government-to-government loans and grants, income redistribution through tax and land reform, public housing, and other social welfare measures. Many of these steps were commendable. Yet they were not in most cases accompanied by efforts to push through economic reforms which would encourage private initiative and enterprise. The continued outflow of private funds from Latin America is sufficient proof of the critical character of the current situation.

"Many countries in Latin America need social reforms as well as measures to provide greater equality of opportunity. However, these broad objectives cannot be achieved without a more rapid rate of economic advance than now is in prospect. And rapid economic growth cannot be achieved without greater emphasis on the private sector. The fact is that some 80 percent of Latin America's national income is today generated by private activities. Consequently, the Alliance for Progress can succeed if—and only if—it builds upon this base and places far greater emphasis on the encouragement of private initiative and investment, both local and foreign.

"To reorient the Alliance for Progress in a direction which offers promise of achieving its objectives involves difficult and sweeping economic reforms. Currencies need to be stabilized through measures to bring government budgets under control and to avoid in-

flationary increases in the supply of money, and credit. Efforts along these lines could lead to the removal of the many exchange controls which still remain and which inhibit economic growth in many nations. At the same time, governments should act to remove the network of other controls which restrict enterprise and sustain local, high-cost monopolies. Economic growth, and the real benefits to all participants in the community which can accrue from growth, are maximized in an atmosphere of political and economic stability under which competitive private enterprise can thrive.

"In a very real sense, the Alliance for Progress is concerned with the age-old problem of trying to bake a bigger pie and divide the slices more evenly at the same time. The emphasis to date has been mostly on the side of slicing the pie. While such efforts may be desirable in the long run, the immediate effect has been to shrink the potential size of the pie. Experience around the world shows clearly that the national welfare is better served by far through policies which enlarge the entire pie.

"To accelerate economic advance in Latin America, efforts on many fronts will be required. Governments have important roles to play—in such areas as schools, health, farm extension services and roads. However, the overriding needs is for an increased flow of private capital from both local and foreign sources and for a significant and continuing improvement in the efficiency with which all resources, including most importantly human resources, are used.

"For these reasons, we urge that U.S. policies be reoriented to place far greater emphasis on the encouragement of private enterprise and investment. What has been done to date along these lines is simply not enough. The encouragement of private enterprise, local and foreign, must become the main thrust of the Alliance. This would involve two major changes in U.S. policy.

"The first requirement is that the governments—and, as far as possible, the people—of Latin America know that the United States has changed its policy so as to put primary stress on improvement in the general business climate as a prerequisite for social development and reform. It must be made clear that U.S. policy in this hemisphere is based on the need for rapid economic growth and on the belief, confirmed by all available evidence, that this can be achieved within a reasonably free political framework only if private capital is given the opportunity to work in a favorable environment. This means that our policies should be consistent throughout the area and should discourage tendencies toward nationalization of industries and encourage setting up explicit rules which provide for truly reasonable indemnification where nationalization has taken place.

"In addition we should discourage policies which tend to distort normal economic relationships—policies leading to overvalued, and multivalued exchange systems, complex import controls with high and highly variable tariffs, quotas and other forms of trade restriction, price controls and highly unpredictable budgetary practice. In short, emphasis should be placed on creating an atmosphere in which private business planning can go on without undue concern about possible changes in the rules of the game. Countries following these policies should be given tangible and active support.

"To make this position clear and unambiguous, it would be necessary for the President to proclaim it in a major address in which he not only spells out the rationale behind the new policy, but also indicates the tools available to the United States to help make it effective. The most important of these tools would be the U.S. foreign aid program.

SENDER WILL CHECK CLASSIFICATION TOP AND BOTTOM			
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL	
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP			
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	DDCI 7D6011	2/9/63 1515	2/22/63
2	<i>Leg. Counsel</i>		
3			
4			
5			
6			
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY	PREPARE REPLY
APPROVAL		DISPATCH	RECOMMENDATION
COMMENT		FILE	RETURN
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION	SIGNATURE
Remarks:			
<i>Cuba file</i>			
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER			
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.			DATE
Legislative Counsel, 7D01			19 Feb 63
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL	
		SECRET	

would give assurances against an invasion of Cuba. The U.S.S.R. removed the missiles, and the United States of America ended the quarantine. But Castro would not permit United Nations observers to come to Cuba, and consequently the United States would give no assurances against invasion.

What we have now is a substitute for the original agreement. We are able to carry on photographic reconnaissance without interference from the Soviet anti-aircraft weapons. And Cuba is getting, in lieu of a U.S. guarantee against invasion, a buildup of its defensive capabilities. Both Moscow and Washington know that this strange working arrangement cannot be upset deliberately without bringing on a much mightier confrontation than that of last October.

CLOSE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPRESENTATIVES AND PUBLISHERS OF WEEKLY PAPERS

(Mr. HARDING (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, one of the privileges of serving a congressional district in the Nation's Capital is the close relationship that a Congressman has with the publishers of weekly papers in his district.

During the past couple of years I have come to know and to admire the publisher of a small newspaper in Shoshone, Idaho—Herb Love.

This man can best be described by the inscription on a plaque recently presented to him by the Idaho Press Association which bestowed upon him the Master Editor-Publisher Award which is the highest honor the weekly press can bestow upon one of its members.

The inscription reads:

He has worked hard, lived honestly, thought soundly, influenced wisely, and is entitled to the highest honor in his profession.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point in the Record the account of the awarding of this honor to Herb Love as it is reported in the Lincoln County Journal of January 17, 1963.

This excellent county paper is now being published by a young and energetic newspaperman, John George, who gives every indication of also becoming one of Idaho's outstanding weekly publishers.

The above-mentioned follows:

IDAHO'S HIGHEST JOURNALISM HONOR AWARDED TO EDITOR FROM SHOSHONE

The highest honor that the Idaho Press Association can bestow on one of its members, the Master Editor-Publisher Award, was presented to Herb. H. Love, Saturday night. The award crowns a journalistic career of 23 years.

Editors and publishers throughout Idaho, assembled at Hotel Boise for a banquet at the conclusion of their annual meeting, vigorously applauded their approval when the name of the winner was announced.

The honor is one that is not lightly given. Winners are determined by a selection committee of Idaho editors and publishers.

The inscription on the plaque presented Mr. Love sums up the devotion and talent he has given to journalism in these words:

He has worked hard, lived honorably, thought soundly, influenced unselfishly, and

is entitled to the highest honor in his profession."

Lincoln County may well be proud of the man who has served them so well for the past 19 years.

Mr. Love was born in South Dakota and reared in Iowa. He attended Iowa State Teachers College and Iowa State College, earning his bachelor of arts degree from the teachers college in 1924. During World War I he served in the U.S. Navy.

The new master editor-publisher came to Idaho in 1925 to serve as superintendent of schools at Fairfield, a post he held for 2 years. He coached athletics at Halley for a year, and was an instructor in the Wendell school for 2 years before leaving the teaching profession because of physical disability.

He married Helen Shuey of Wendell at Richfield in 1929. The couple have two children, a son, John, employed by Ball Products Co. of Boulder, Colo., and a daughter, Mrs. Judith Abraham, a student at Kansas City Art Institute.

From 1933 to 1944 Mr. Love was assessor of Gooding County, resigning in his sixth term to assume ownership of the Lincoln County Journal.

He founded the Gooding Independent in 1936 and owned the paper until 1940, at which time it was sold and merged with the Gooding Leader. He is a charter member of the Gooding Lions Club and served as its president just before coming to Shoshone.

Mr. Love was commander of the Shoshone American Legion Post in 1949, and was elected district commander in 1950. He is also a past president of the Shoshone Chamber of Commerce and the Shoshone Rotary Club. From 1955 to 1959 he served on the Shoshone City Council.

Mr. Love purchased the Journal from Glen Maxwell in May of 1944 and operated the paper for almost 19 years.

He was president of the Idaho Press Association in 1948, and was a director of the Idaho Newspaper Advertising Service for two terms before being elected president of that organization.

Mr. and Mrs. Love will remain in Shoshone, but plan an extended trip through Colorado, Texas, and Florida this winter.

GENERAL EXCELLENCE

The Lincoln County Journal was awarded first place for general excellence in its circulation bracket at the press association's annual convention in Boise last weekend. The Journal has now won the top award for 4 years in succession.

Contest judges were publishers and press association managers in Arizona, Montana, Nevada, and Washington.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

(Mr. ST. GERMAIN (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the measure I am introducing today, a bill to establish a land and water conservation fund, embodies the administration's program to further provide for the outdoor recreation needs of the Nation.

In his conservation message last year, President Kennedy warned that our present sources of recreation are not adequate to meet current demands. It is his view and mine that we must take positive action now, for as he wisely points out, "actions deferred are all too

often opportunities lost, particularly in safeguarding our natural resources."

The legislation I am presenting today is a far-reaching proposal which provides for today's recreation needs while anticipating those of the near future. While the bill is fundamentally the same as the one submitted last year, the new version authorizes a program for 50 percent matching grants to the States for planning, and 30-percent grants for acquisition and development of needed outdoor recreation resources. The States will share the funds available in the following manner: one-fifth divided equally, three-fifths apportioned on the basis of population, and one-fifth allocated according to need.

In order for a State to qualify for assistance, it must have a comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan, and the States are eligible to receive assistance in the preparation of such a plan and for the training of necessary personnel. Also, in anticipation of escalating prices for the future acquisition of land for recreational purposes, the bill limits expenditures for State development work for the next 10 years to 10 percent of the funds available for State assistance. The funds provided by this bill will also be available for acquisition of land and water which is authorized for areas of the national park system and areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior for outdoor recreation purposes; the national forest system; purposes of national areas for the preservation of species of fish or wildlife threatened with extinction; and incidental recreation purposes in connection with national fish and wildlife conservation areas as authorized by law.

Revenue sources provided by the bill include proceeds from entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees or charges established by the President for Federal land and water areas; proceeds from the sale of Federal surplus real property; and the proceeds of the 4-cent-per-gallon tax on gasoline and special motor fuels used in motorboats. While the Treasury will hold a portion of these revenues for acquisition of additional lands at Federal and federally assisted projects, the greater portion would be used to help finance State and Federal programs.

For the purpose of assuring the financing of the program when the States are prepared for full participation, advance appropriations of \$60 million a year for 8 years are authorized beginning with the third year, with provision for repayment from one-half of the revenues available to the fund. The fund will be used in the proportion of 60 percent for State purposes and 40 percent either way depending on need.

This measure is in complete accord with the recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. It is fiscally sound and forward looking. I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that it will receive favorable action at this session of Congress and that the country will be able to realize its benefits in the near future.

THE LATE HONORABLE ROBERT RICE REYNOLDS

(Mr. TAYLOR (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, citizens of North Carolina and people across the Nation were saddened last Wednesday by the death of former U.S. Senator Robert Rice Reynolds at his home in Asheville, N.C.

Mr. Reynolds represented North Carolina in the U.S. Senate from 1933 until his retirement from the Senate in 1945. He ranks among the most colorful and controversial figures in American political history. He stormed Washington with a grandeur perhaps never to be duplicated. He was different and glamorous and those about him quickly realized it.

Perhaps no other U.S. Senator brought to Washington such a wide variety of experience as did Robert R. Reynolds. He had been a professional wrestler, a football coach, a war correspondent, an author, an actor, a motion-picture producer, and a criminal lawyer. He loved outdoor life and his earliest political campaigns were conducted traveling by horse in the North Carolina mountains.

His appearance in the Nation's Capital followed his famous campaign of 1932 which he launched with \$20 and a T-model Ford purchased on the installment plan. His majority in the election was one of the largest in North Carolina's history. He arrived in Washington in his "rusty and trusty" Ford and showed no hesitation in driving it to White House teas and other black tie occasions.

When he returned to North Carolina he stated that he had taken his faithful Ford to the Capital and parked it between two Cadillacs in a million-dollar garage which Mr. Hoover had built and that it rolled its mud-splattered eyes around and looked up at him and said: "Bob, ain't we in society now?"

Bob Reynolds' stories, similar to the one above, are told all over North Carolina. They are told here in Washington. He will be remembered as a legendary son of the Blue Ridge Mountains.

Affectionately known as "Our Bob" by friends back home and sometimes referred to as "Buncombe Bob," Senator Reynolds was the founder of the American Nationalist Party in 1941 and rose to the chairmanship of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

A great deal more could be said about the accomplishments and activities and controversies of Senator Reynolds as a Member of Congress, but I wish to touch briefly on the human qualities of this foremost American citizen.

He was sincerely concerned for the people he represented. His personality was magnetic; his charm, warm and abiding. Perhaps his greatest attribute, however, was that he never forgot his friends.

His rich personality, keen sense of humor, and loyalty to his friends endeared him to the people of North Carolina.

Bob Reynolds loved life and he lived it fully.

PANAMA CANAL PROCRASTINATION PERILOUS

(Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it has been aptly stated that the history of the Panama Canal is one of continuing crises. Those of key character concern the best site and the best type, known as the battle of routes and battle of the levels. Moreover, this pattern of struggle reappears periodically, and since 1947 the question of the proper modernization of the Panama Canal has been beset with repetitions of these old controversies in slightly modified forms.

Over a period of years, a number of Members of the Congress, several in the House but only one in the Senate, who have made serious studies of the canal question and recognized its magnitude, have introduced bills to create the Inter-oceanic Canals Commission. In so doing, it was their purpose to provide an effective agency to develop a timely, definite, and wisely reasoned isthmian canal policy, which the Congress and the Nation can accept and which time and usage will justify.

Unfortunately, this task has been complicated immeasurably by the ratification in 1955 of a secretly contrived canal treaty between the United States and Panama and by the nationalization in 1956 of the Suez Canal by Egypt. Despite the inherent differences between the juridical foundations of the two inter-oceanic canals, this action by Egypt served to evoke a chain of aggressive nationalistic and communistic revolutionary inspired agitations in Panama, some of them marked by mob violence led by well-trained leaders. The long-range objectives of this revolutionary movement is the wresting of the sovereign control of the Panama Canal from the United States and the extortion of greater benefits from the toll revenues. The only basis for such aims is that inherent in Panama's geographical location, which is adjacent to the Canal Zone territory. The difficulties of securing increased transit capacity have now become severely aggravated by the necessity for safeguarding the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the United States over the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone.

As a start in this direction, I made a series of major addresses in the House beginning in 1957 and continuing up to the present Congress. These included, in comprehensive detail, the diplomatic and legislative history of the acquisition by the United States in 1904 of our territorial possession known as the Panama Canal Zone.

Though these efforts were generally ignored in the mass news media of the United States or, when presented, had their meaning distorted, they were prominently featured in the press of Panama, especially in the Spanish language papers, which I follow closely. Through the latter, they have produced echoes from various countries of Latin America.

The failure on the part of elements in our Department of State to stop the depredations of isthmian agitators by means of forthright declarations of U.S. policy, in the course of time, has led to a chain of diplomatic victories by Panama, making the United States a laughing stock in the Western Hemisphere. So confident did anti-U.S. extremists become that the Panamanian National Assembly even attempted to encircle the Canal Zone by enacting legislation extending the 3-mile limit to 12 miles, with Panama controlling the water at each end of the zone's 3-mile limit, which could have made that waterway another Berlin. This attempt, our Government very promptly and properly refused to recognize, but friction resulted.

The radical leadership in the Panama National Assembly, which includes some Marxist-Leninists, obviously understood the significance of my researches in the exposure of their schemes and did not stop with the attempted encirclement of the Canal Zone. It followed up by giving me the unique distinction of being formally declared as public enemy No. 1 of Panama.

The situation on the isthmus was worsened on September 17, 1960, when the President of the United States, in a mistaken gesture of friendship, by an Executive order soon after the adjournment of the Congress, directed the formal display of the Panamanian flag outside the flag of the United States at one place in the Canal Zone as evidence of a so-called titular sovereignty of Panama over the zone. This unfortunate precedent of striking the American flag in the Canal Zone, as predicted by me on the floor of the House, merely served to open the door, for in Panama and elsewhere, the action was interpreted as a belated United States recognition of Panamanian sovereignty.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would invite attention to the fact that on February 2, 1960, after full debate, the House of Representatives approved House Concurrent Resolution 459, 86th Congress, against such display by the overwhelming vote of 381 to 12, which was transmitted to the Senate but, for reasons not published, was never acted upon by that body. In addition, the Congress passed the Gross amendment to the Department of Commerce Appropriations Act prohibiting the expenditure of funds embraced in the act for such purpose. No wonder isthmian extremists became emboldened and arrogant.

Under these circumstances, the necessity for an effective counterpoise to Panama became clearly evident. This compensating force developed in the form of growing demands for a second canal at Nicaragua, the ancient rival of the Panamanian site, and elsewhere. In an address to the House on June 30, 1960, I undertook to give a comprehensive description of the Nicaraguan project, which was largely based on a 1931 report—House Document No. 139, 72d Congress—and to advocate its consideration. The second canal idea, thus stimulated, served as an antidote for Castroism in Panama and to still some of the violent

morning was offered by Rabbi Theodore Lewis, of Touro Synagogue, in my home city of Newport, R.I. Touro Synagogue is the oldest synagogue in the United States, and it is this year marking the 200th anniversary of its founding. It stands today as a symbol of an often-forgotten right in American society—the right to be different.

It is most fitting that we note this American right and this anniversary today because this week has also been designated as Brotherhood Week, a time when we pause to extend the hand of friendship and understanding to all Americans whatever their differences of race, color, or creed. Rabbi Lewis comes to us today as the living embodiment of all these traditions, handed down now through two centuries of Touro Synagogue's proud history of service to her congregation, to our city, and to the Nation.

I am happy indeed to welcome him to the Senate today.

RATIFICATION OF ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT BY MONTANA AND CALIFORNIA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on February 7 I announced that the legislatures of six States had approved the anti-poll-tax amendment which the 87th Congress submitted for ratification last year.

Today, Mr. President, I am happy to announce that the legislatures of two more States have ratified the amendment, making eight States in all which have acted favorably. They are the State of Montana, which approved its ratifying resolution by a vote of 51 to 4, the Montana Assembly having approved its resolution 6 days earlier, on January 22, by a vote of 56 to 37; and the State of California, whose legislature, I have been informed, has approved the amendment, the California Senate by a vote of 34 to 0 and the California House by a vote of 70 to 3, final ratification becoming effective on February 7, 1963.

Mr. President, I especially wish to express my appreciation to our distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who directed much time and effort in the last few weeks to working with the leaders of the Montana Legislature in obtaining favorable action on the amendment. His assistance last year in obtaining Senate action here was indispensable.

I also wish, Mr. President, to extend my appreciation to my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], who cosponsored, vigorously supported, and has worked equally hard for ratification of the amendment by the legislature of his State.

Also, Mr. President, I wish to express my equally warm appreciation to the two distinguished Senators from California [Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. ENGLE], who also have worked valiantly from the very beginning in truly bipartisan spirit to obtain the gratifying results which have occurred in their great State.

SUBSIDIZATION OF BOHEMIA LIBRE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on February 8, 1963, the Washington Daily News published an article entitled "Has CIA Killed Anti-Castro Mag?"

The article describes the publication Bohemia Libre and the extent of its subsidization by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. The article reports that the subsidy apparently has been withdrawn.

At one point the article states:

According to this magazine's staffer, Bohemia Libre furnished a U.S. Senator with photos of the Russian buildup in Cuba and that didn't help the administration either. The Senator he named is currently a Democrat.

I do not know why my name was not used directly by the newspaper, when it was the senior Senator from Oregon who obviously was involved.

To set the record straight, I wish to say that these photographs were not furnished to me; they were offered to me. I responded by suggesting that the pictures be taken to the appropriate intelligence agencies of the U.S. Government. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that was the only appropriate response that I could make, or should have made, to the offerer of the photographs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the newspaper article, the telegram I received on January 24 from the publisher of Bohemia Libre, and my reply to him dated January 30.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 8, 1963]

DEATH OF A BOHEMIAN—HAS CIA KILLED ANTI-CASTRO MAG?

Bohemia Libre, sensational anti-Castro weekly magazine, has quit publishing and some say the CIA blew the whistle on it. At any rate, publication has been suspended. For how long, nobody knows; it may be forever.

Reports from Miami's Cuban colony are that the Central Intelligence Agency had been subsidizing it, and a couple of weeks ago, got tired. CIA itself doesn't care to discuss rumors.

Bohemia, one of the most spectacular and successful Spanish language periodicals in the Western Hemisphere when it was published in its palatial plant in Havana, idolized Castro both before and after he took over Cuba.

FERVID SUPPORT

During Bohemia's Havana days, its odd-ball publisher, Don Miguel Angel Quevedo, from his exotic modern office paneled in rare woods, complete with lavish washroom with lavender bidet, directed uncritical and fervid support for whatever Fidel said or did.

Bohemia gave U.S. newsmen covering Cuba—such as the famous Latin America Reporter Jules duBois of the Chicago Tribune—the hero treatment as long as they sympathized with Castro's revolution. When they became disillusioned, Bohemia exposed the same U.S. reporters as spies, agents, and colonels in the CIA.

Finally Castro's Red-glared eyes covetously focused on Bohemia's expensive printing

plant and Publisher Quevedo packed his bags and barely made the plane.

So he joined the exiles.

Bohemia thus became Bohemia Libre in exile and in sheer vitriol outdid all other Castro critics (no mean feat, these days).

TRONY

* It is an irony, say Cuban exiles, that Bohemia now is portrayed in the very role it accused U.S. newsmen of playing: agent of the CIA.

There's no doubt that Bohemia Libre's spectacular format and content—it's a sort of hot-licks, Police Gazette version of Life magazine—made effective propaganda in several Caribbean areas, as well as among Cuban exiles in the United States, at least until the Bay of Pigs disaster in April, 1961.

There is also no doubt that since then, it has been not so sharp a tool. But, there is also no doubt that the Red propagandists in Havana would crow over its final demise.

Here are several versions of why Bohemia hasn't been going to press recently:

1. A cartoon of the Kennedy family scheduled for page 1 on January 1, was so insulting that the CIA lowered the boom.

2. That knowledge of CIA support had leaked so that it had ruined the magazine's effectiveness.

3. That the magazine has simply lost its effectiveness anyway, since the groups it supported lost the Bay of Pigs battle.

4. That if the actual size of the CIA's subsidy of Bohemia Libre got into the hands of Congress, it would embarrass the Kennedy administration—and the CIA—just about as thoroughly as the Bay of Pigs disaster itself.

5. White House adviser Arthur Schlesinger found Bohemia Libre "too conservative," according to one of the magazine's editorial workers, who also said there were financial problems.

According to this magazine's staffer, Bohemia Libre furnished a U.S. Senator with photos of the Russian buildup in Cuba and that didn't help with the administration, either. The Senator he named is currently a Democrat.

A MILLION

As to the size of the alleged subsidy; depending on who's talking, CIA spent more than a million dollars on Bohemia Libre, or spent \$2,500 a week on it for a couple of years, or paid just the office rent—\$2,400 a month.

Bohemia Libre may not be as dead as its recent failures to publish indicate. Bohemia's boss and staff are well known as lively and resourceful people among such interests as sugar, rum and various export firms, and recently Publisher Quevedo was in Puerto Rico reportedly trying to interest the "statehood-for-Puerto Rico" group. Mr. Quevedo also has his eye on certain interests in the Dominican Republic and in Venezuela as possible angels.

So far, reports have it, no angels are flying.

JANUARY 30, 1963.

Mr. MIGUEL ANGEL QUEVEDO,
Editor and Publisher,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR Mr. ANGEL QUEVEDO: I have your telegram of January 24 offering me a collection of photographs on Cuba's military strength.

Although I appreciate your support of my course of action in regard to Cuba and the spirit in which your telegram was sent, I suggest that it would be more useful to make these photographs available to the agencies of the Government who are responsible for collecting intelligence concerning Cuba.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

on vocational education and the very great role vocational education can play, but is not now playing, in providing jobs for our young people. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record, and I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EDUCATION, JOB TRAINING VITAL

A few figures quickly gave the dimensions of one of America's critical problems.

In the decade of the 1960's automation and related forms of technical change are expected to eliminate 2.5 million jobs. In the same decade, 26 million young people will reach working age, twice as many as in the 1950's. To give them employment, the Nation will have to create 25,000 new jobs every week. The Nation will also have to see to it that the young people are trained to handle the jobs.

How inadequately job creation and job preparation are now being accomplished is suggested by the January employment report of the U.S. Department of Labor. It shows that 13 percent of the teenagers seeking employment and 9 percent of those 20 to 25 could not find jobs in 1962. For non-whites the problem is particularly serious. The unemployment rate runs in excess of 80 percent for urban Negro boys.

Approximately one young jobseeker out of every three enters the labor market as a high school dropout. He lacks not only job skills but the scholastic background to acquire them. A Department of Labor official who visited Milwaukee recently pointed out that apprenticeship programs were closed to dropouts and that the armed services were rejecting virtually all youngsters who "can't show a high school diploma." He said further that only 5 percent of present unskilled jobs would still exist by 1970.

Retraining is looked to as the hopeful means of preparing workers displaced by automation for new and more demanding jobs. For youths who haven't become workers in any real sense of the word, the hope lies in vocational training—training that will excite young people and hold them until they acquire skills to get and hold good jobs.

How effective is our present vocational training program? Not very, according to many studies. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch calls for reformation of vocational schools. A survey by the Taconic Foundation reports: "It is extremely questionable whether the training absorbed by vocational high school graduates is useful to them in getting employment and advancing on the job."

The Post-Dispatch makes a further point: Last year 44.5 percent of Federal vocational education funds went for agricultural training although barely 1 young person in 15 can look forward to farm labor. At a time when emphasis should be on orderly transfer of people from the land to the city, this allocation of funds makes little sense.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TUESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is

anticipated that tomorrow the Senate will consider nominations on the Executive Calendar; committee assignments and selection of chairmen of committees; and also a continuing resolution for the special committees whose authority has expired.

FIFTY-MILE HIKES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, this Nation is periodically swept by various activities known as the latest craze. Currently, as we are all well aware, 50-mile hikes are the thing to do. Mr. President, I am not against 50-mile hikes, for those young enough and well enough conditioned they are probably a worthwhile form of exercise. And certainly anything that calls attention to the need for physical fitness should not be deprecated.

However much some of these hikes may be only publicity gimmicks, not all of them are that alone. I was particularly pleased to learn that when certain young people of my State took up this activity, for example, they added a different twist that gave an entirely new meaning to hiking.

Mr. President, the students at Northwest Center, a junior college in Powell, Wyo., realized that the first 50-mile hikers in that State would receive considerable publicity, and they decided this publicity should be put to good use. So, instead of marching for the glory of the school or club, they marched to publicize the need for clothing for the children of Teraco, Peru, a community high in the Andes Mountains. These students were well aware of the lack of adequate clothing in that remote village because a former student leader, Walter VandeVeegaete, is now serving there in the Peace Corps.

I am most happy to report that this combination of youthful spirits and humanitarian purpose found a sympathetic and enthusiastic reception in the hearts of Wyoming's citizens. These students set out yesterday to walk—in 1 day—from Powell to Cody, Wyo., and return, a distance in excess of 50 miles. And when the eight survivors, including two young women, struggled across the finish line they were met by the news that more than 1 ton of clothing had already been collected and much more was on the way. One of the marchers, incidentally, was Walter VandeVeegaete's sister, Ramona.

Mr. President, we have heard much in recent years about the sad state of our youth. They grow up in luxury, critics say, and are soft and selfish, neither understanding or caring about the traditions that made this country great. The activities of the Peace Corps and the tremendous job done by our youth, in less than normal American living conditions, was the first large-scale event to give the lie to this criticism of our youth. I would that our adults could match our youth, not only in education, but in ingenuity in ideas.

The activities of the college students in Powell, Wyo., have served as further evidence that our national ideals are still strong in the hearts and souls of our

youth, and that they have displayed typical American ingenuity to further a worthwhile cause. They have demonstrated this in preserving the national ideals which we associate with the history of our country. This is the spirit of cooperation which has helped to build the frontier, whether it be old or new. It is very much alive today.

DEATH OF OTTO D. SCHMIDT, RECIPIENT OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in 1906, while in the service of the U.S. Navy, Otto D. Schmidt reacted heroically to the explosion of a boiler aboard the U.S.S. *Bennington*. For his actions in saving the lives of a number of the crew, he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, this Nation's highest military honor.

From 1922 until his retirement in 1948, Mr. Schmidt was an employee of the post office in Norfolk, Nebr. He walked some 69,000 miles carrying the mail to his neighbors in Norfolk.

Mr. Schmidt served his country honorably both as a seaman and a civilian. On Sunday, February 10, 1963, he passed away. His death reduced the number of those awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor now living to 290, only 14 of whom are peacetime recipients. Mr. Schmidt was the last living Nebraskan to be given this medal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the article about Mr. Otto D. Schmidt, of Blair, Nebr., published in the Norfolk, Nebr., Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be published in the Record, as follows:

EX-NORFOLK MEDAL OF HONOR HERO IS DEAD

Otto D. Schmidt, 78, Blair, the only Norfolk resident ever to wear the Congressional Medal of Honor, died Sunday at Blair after a lingering illness.

Funeral arrangements are pending.

Mr. Schmidt, a retired Norfolk mail carrier, was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor along with nine other Navy men for heroism in the explosion of a boiler in the U.S.S. *Bennington* off the coast of San Diego in 1906.

After the explosion, which killed 113 of the 136 men aboard, Mr. Schmidt ran to the deck and helped rescue some of the wounded. He also went into the blast-wrecked boiler room and pulled out injured men.

For a few years before World War II, Mr. Schmidt had the distinction of being the only resident of Nebraska to wear the Congressional Medal of Honor.

He came to Norfolk in 1917 and started working for the post office in 1922. He retired August 31, 1948, after having walked about 69,000 miles.

After his retirement at Norfolk Mr. Schmidt went to Blair to live.

He is survived by one son, Dale, of San Monica. He was preceded in death by his wife.

COMMENT ON PRAYER OFFERED TODAY BY RABBI THEODORE LEWIS, OF TOURO SYNAGOGUE, NEWPORT, R.I.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is most appropriate that our opening prayer this

UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP					
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS		DATE		INITIALS
1	DDCI		2/22/63		
2	<i>Leg. Counsel</i>		<i>[Signature]</i>		
3					
4					
5					
6					
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY		PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL		DISPATCH		RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT		FILE		RETURN	
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION		SIGNATURE	
<p>Remarks: Attached is an extract from the <u>Congressional Record</u> of 18 February containing statements made by Senator Morse against the Agency in connection with the recent <u>Daily News</u> article. As indicated, Senator Morse has stated he plans to have much more to say on this subject.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 50px; width: 300px; margin: 10px auto;"></div> <p style="text-align: center;">Assistant Legislative Counsel</p> <p>cc: DCI, DDCI</p>					
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER					
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.					DATE
<p>Approved For Release 2004/06/23 : CIA-RDP65B00383R000200230055-7</p>					
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	

STAT

NEW YORK, N.Y., January 24, 1963.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.

Bohemia Libre magazine congratulates and supports you on Cuban military buildup offering you a sensational collection of photographs received yesterday from underground sources on Fidel Castro's military strength.

MIGUEL ANGEL QUEVEDO.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, to my mind, this episode emphasizes the whole question of the extent of the subsidization of Cuban exiled groups and publication outlets. It raises in my mind a question of how much it is costing the American taxpayers to keep publications and political organizations of this kind operating among the Cuban refugees.

A still more serious question is, for what purposes does the CIA subsidize them? These Cuban refugees are well known in Congress as a source of allegations about both the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion and, now, the state of Soviet military forces in Cuba. Bohemia Libre modestly calls its own pictures "sensational." With the current spate of congressional reports, as opposed to administration reports, the Russian buildup, which cite alleged missile installations and alleged numbers of Russian troops in Cuba, one must assume that other Members of Congress have been offered not only pictures but countless allegations, as well, by the Cuban refugees, their political organs, and their publicity organs.

I am very much concerned about the practice of the CIA of giving financial subsidies to these organizations and publications. It raises the suspicion that they can be used by the Agency to whip up and inflame American opinion and, in effect, to influence the making of policy on Cuba in a way that the CIA is not permitted to do directly. It raises the suspicion that the taxpayers' money is being used to promote a particular policy favored by the Agency, one which may not be in keeping with or may even be contrary to that of the administration.

The CIA's relationship with the exiled groups points again, in my opinion, to the need for congressional supervision of the Agency.

Therefore, Mr. President, today I serve notice that I plan to answer to Mr. Allen Dulles magazine article of recent date in which he seeks to support the thesis that the CIA should not be subject to a watchdog congressional committee. Again I state—as I have stated for years in the Senate—that the CIA should be brought under congressional control, for the simple reason that in democratic America no agency should be given police-state powers. In effect, the CIA exercises police-state powers. They should be taken away from it, and the Democratic administration should take them away from it.

Later this week or next week I shall support that thesis by a rather detailed presentation of some CIA policies which I do not believe are in the interest of maintaining peace in the world. The CIA seeks to justify them on the ground that if one is going to beat Russia, Russian methods must be used. Mr.

President, we hear this argument—"The end justifies the means"—used by too many Government agencies, State and national. In my judgment, such an argument endangers very precious principles of freedom. I cannot reconcile some of the activities of the CIA with the maintenance of precious rights of freedom to the American people. Such secrecy should be stopped.

The little experience I have recently had in connection with the pictures which were offered to me bears out my point. Apparently when a magazine or a newspaper such as Bohemia Libre offers to a Senator information which deals with the foreign policy of the United States, one cannot be sure but what it is being offered with the approval of CIA.

AMERICAN-ISRAEL RELATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a speech on American-Israel relations, delivered in New York City on February 10 by one of the great living Americans, Ambassador Philip M. Klutznick. For the past 2 years Mr. Klutznick has very effectively served our Government as U.S. representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Recently he resigned. I am satisfied that he resigned for two compelling reasons: One, health; the other, to take care of his personal business affairs.

In making this request, I wish to say that in the wonderful speech on American-Israel relations which he made in New York City on February 10, he has left with us an account of his views on that subject which I think every Member of Congress should read. His speech is an excellent one; and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AMERICAN-ISRAEL RELATIONS

(By Philip M. Klutznick to B'nai Zion, New York City, February 10, 1963)

At your annual dinner a few years ago, you honored a Senator who later became President of the United States. He discussed American-Israel relationships in positive and candid terms. He amplified these views during the campaign for the presidency in a brilliant and constructive address in August 1960. In it he set some difficult and challenging goals for himself. In my 2 years of intimate concern with events inside the administration affecting American-Israel relationships, I found no gap between President Kennedy's views as he stated them earlier and his earnest and dedicated performance as our Nation's Chief Executive.

As a consequence, I am saddened by rumors attending my recent resignation. In the English Jewish press in Canada, the United Kingdom, and Israel, and through some editorial comment in the United States, it was suggested that the real cause of my resignation was my alleged dissatisfaction with the administration's attitude toward Israel. Such rumors are complete and unfounded nonsense. In a matter so vital, I would not play fast and loose with either the administration or the Jewish community. In spite of problems that have arisen and may again arise, I am proud to have been as-

sociated officially with the administration. I am convinced that President Kennedy is performing in the best interests of the United States and in keeping with a positive, progressive, and constructive policy in American-Israel relationships.

I appreciate fully your desire to do me honor. The devotion of B'nai Zion to the Jewish National Fund I have shared since boyhood. My mind goes back to the days when in countless Jewish homes the only positive symbol of hope for the realization of the dream of centuries was the little blue box—the pushka of the JNF. It is for this and reasons of long friendship that I am honored to be here tonight. I knew when your committee called on me that I would be leaving the Government service at the end of 1962. I felt that I would want to make public expression on American-Israel relationships. This was the platform from which our President chose, while he was a Senator, to clarify his views on the subject. It certainly is an appropriate place for an American, who is a Jew, to do likewise. This is especially true after 2 years in which diplomatic propriety demanded a high measure of public silence.

Let there be no illusions about my official role. My duties as a U.S. Ambassador in the United Nations concerned economic, social, and financial matters. The politically surcharged item of American-Israel relations was never assigned to me either at the Permanent Mission or during General Assembly sessions. Whatever I did in that regard was informal either at the request of my superiors or at my own suggestion. But, I was always guided by the proprieties of relationship within a government.

It has been an edifying experience for me to watch the American-Jewish community for the first time in years from a relatively detached vantage point. No less interesting has been the opportunity to observe the performance of Israel and its diplomatic corps at close quarters and in its natural habitat where we met as fellow diplomats each with unalloyed commitment to serve different though friendly countries.

It is my conclusion that the State of Israel and its personnel have matured and grown rapidly both in their understanding and in their performance in the international arena. On the other hand, the American-Jewish community seems to be floundering. We are still trying to understand our own role within this our own country and in our relationship to Israel and other Jewish communities of the world. This is not a criticism. It is a sincere observation made in good faith out of the hope that we can do something about it.

This is an enormous reaction in our Jewish community when incidents involved in American-Israel relationships arise. Therefore, trying to anticipate and to understand this relationship may be the very key to an accelerated maturity as well as a more effective role for the American-Jewish community. For all problems are by no means solved.

By now, we know that regional tensions like those in the Middle East are more difficult, if not impossible, of solution, so long as the struggle between the West and the East is unresolved or unstabilized. There is just too much room for competition for temporary favors sought and granted by competing sides to permit solid and lasting solutions.

We are living in an unusual epoch. Big powers possess the greatest and most destructive military strength in history. But it remains virtually immobilized while big powers compete for the friendship of small, weak, and poor nations. The meek have truly interited the earth. Any sane and reasonable attitude toward American-Israel relationships must reflect intelligently on

this reality. Whether we approve of certain relationships or not, it must be expected that our Nation, in its own national interest, will maintain friendly and helpful contacts with many nations, including not only Israel but Arab, African, Latin American and Asian states which appear to merit such consideration. The peace of the world requires it.

Another aspect is self-evident but bears repetition. On many issues, Israel aligns herself with the West (she has one of the best, if not the best, records of voting on the same side as the United States in the United Nations among nontreaty states). Yet Israel is sovereign and as such acts as she should in what she considers her own best interest. It is no less true of our own Nation. Israel is not a satellite of the United States or of the West; nor is the United States a satellite of Israel. Both Nations are blessed with able, intelligent and energetic leadership. Where energy, intelligence and movement are present, possibilities for occasional differences arise even while the fundamental relationship is sound and friendly.

Then again, the United States maintains relationships with many friendly nations, some of which are unfriendly to one another. The Israel-Arab situation is not unique. The United States is friendly to both Pakistan and India. Has this solved the Kashmir bitterness? The United States did its best to help set at rest the West Iria conflict between the Netherlands and Indonesia. During the process, Indonesia moved closer to the Soviet and the Dutch publicly berated us at home. Or one might ponder on the discomfort of trying to be a constructive friend to Portugal and to South Africa while trying to maintain the United States' historic belief in the self-determination of peoples. This has not made life with either Portugal or South Africa or, for that matter, with some of the new African nations, a bed of roses. Need one make the point more effectively than to note the occasions when the United States found itself at odds with its oldest ally, France, including the startling events of recent days, and with its close and old ally, the United Kingdom. In an overwrought, exceedingly tense and fluid world, we must expect momentary incongruities. These are usually passing phases with little impact on long-term interests and more profound mutualities.

The closest of friends among the nations of the world go through periods of disagreement, and foes find moments of agreement. Consequently there is always the possibility that differences can arise between the Governments of the United States and Israel. When in the judgment of the governments of states that are friendly national interests conflict, it is not tragic so long as basic and fundamental relationships remain sound.

It is dangerous to elect the role of a prophet but our people have a tradition that encourages the Jew to try prophecy. There are several areas that in the future could bring about momentary or ephemeral differences between the United States and the State of Israel even with as friendly and understanding an administration as that headed by President Kennedy. I would hope that this will not happen but in today's world, anything can happen. Let us examine a few possibilities for a moment.

1. This administration believes deeply in the right and the duty of a state to defend itself from actual or threatened aggression. The recent most classic example is Cuba. At times in the past, and possibly in the future, there have been different approaches to this question by the United States and by Israel. Our Government has held that a member of the United Nations should exhaust the opportunities which that organization affords for peaceful settlement before actually shooting at the other side or shooting back

in retaliation. Even in the case of Cuba, the United States took steps short of gunfire when its whole existence was threatened until the Organization of American States and the Security Council of the United Nations examined the problem.

Israel has openly expressed doubt that it can rely on the Security Council to protect it against Arab States. She has felt, not without some cause, that the Soviet veto is always available so long as the Soviet-Arab flirtation continues. Our country has felt that anticipating a veto does not justify refusing to present a case before retaliation.

It is my estimate that currently there is a better understanding on this question between the United States and Israel. Hopefully, this, with all of its implied risks, might avoid the kind of misunderstanding in the Jewish community that arose in the spring of 1962 when the Security Council censured Israel. But if Israel honestly fears its chances in the Security Council and therefore avoids initiating Security Council's processes when attacked, there is the danger of a repetition of the unhappy events of last year. If this should happen, the important thing will be to determine whether it actually affects the long-term friendly relations between the two countries or is it only an unfortunate, but nevertheless passing phase.

2. Let us take a calm but brief look at the Arab refugee problem. The United States and Israel would both like to see this problem solved. Both countries are generally moved by humanitarianism. But sovereign states cannot afford generosity if other vital interests are seriously and adversely affected. Israel properly fears for its security in the event of large scale repatriation. The sine qua non of sovereignty is the security of a nation's people. I am completely sanguine that the Kennedy administration would never deliberately and consciously encourage a plan which would endanger the security of Israel, no matter how urgent it regards the desirability of an Arab refugee solution. Yet, it is inconceivable that the Congress will continue to make substantial appropriations for UNWRA much longer without evidence that a solution is being actively sought or is on the horizon. It seems patent that both countries agree completely on three things:

- (a) it is politically desirable that the problem be solved;
- (b) a solution must not adversely affect the security of Israel; and
- (c) that simple humanitarianism demands that the problem be solved.

But there can be differences dictated by differing exposures and accountabilities of the governments involved. These differences, if they arise, can only yield to patient and painstaking negotiation between the governments involved. The substitute of polemics will only complicate, not clarify.

Recent events tend to negate the prospect of a serious split on this issue. On a particular amendment in the General Assembly, the United States and Israel stood alone in voting against it. The reasons differed, but the fact created much comment in the halls of the United Nations. The debate in the 17th General Assembly and the voting pattern suggest that maybe basic and overt differences can be avoided. Nevertheless, I am convinced that, in keeping with his public pledges, the President and this administration will try for achievable solutions but with sincere and intelligent regard for Israel's security as well as the welfare of the refugees.

3. In another area of potential static—assistance to states not friendly to Israel—I feel more at home as a result of my recent work. One of the oldest foreign aid debates is whether a donor state should disburse aid to states unless they are allied with it formally and informally. This ques-

tion loses some of its steam if foreign aid is approached from a moral point of view. The United States is the richest and most powerful Nation in the world. Like a rich and powerful individual, it has some responsibility to those less fortunate. How and to what extent it discharges this is within its own control. But, if it acts for selfish reasons alone, the decisions may be self-defeating. Just like philanthropy distributed for self-aggrandisement loses its flavor, so foreign aid used to buy friendships rarely succeeds.

On the other hand, one must candidly recognize that if foreign aid strengthens a country, such added strength can be used for better or for worse. A nation sincerely trying to develop economically has little time and less resource for military adventure. Self-defense is all it can afford at best. Some states have not yet learned this truth.

I believe that the hope for peace in the world depends on the elevation of the economic and social standards of many peoples. This is a fundamental objective of the United Nations Charter. It has symbolized the policy of the United States in this post-war era. It can be honestly argued whether aid extended to certain Arab States will blunt the edge of their antagonisms toward Israel or feed the flame of their hostility. But it cannot be disputed that the presence of a constructive U.S. influence should tend to lessen potential troubles.

This is a disturbing problem. When a state that proclaims belligerence and threatens hostilities against a neighbor is provided food and credits, it is reasonable to assume that it is strengthened to commit war even though the aid itself is directed to other channels. A historic analysis of such situations will demonstrate that there are risks in either aiding or withholding aid in a dangerous world. On the balance, the odds should favor establishing a constructive U.S. influence if possible and in elevating the economic and social level of the people themselves. It is foolhardy to do so recklessly without careful and rational examination accompanied by constant review.

So long as the United States is in the position of making choices and decisions that could affect the cause of peace and the interests of the free world, questions will continue to arise as to whether our policy at a given moment promotes the easing or heightening of tensions in the Middle East. We must be careful to relate what happens to policy objectives, to the degree of caution that is exercised and to the frequency of the review of potentialities. Perhaps, under such circumstances, any open split involving friends of Israel will be averted.

But actually, it is not these dramatic and isolated issues that provide the basic tests of American-Israel relations any more than they do of U.S. relations with many friends. The real tests rest on far more fundamental matters than votes in the United Nations or whether a little more or a little less aid should or should not have been given to a country not friendly to Israel or whether solutions for the Arab refugee problem should be sought in one way or another openly or clandestinely. The real question is will a great power help a relatively new and struggling small state to maintain its independence and its sovereignty if its security is endangered and will it help that state overcome an adverse economic balance so it can escape national poverty.

In these matters of real life or death I speak with complete conviction. The independence and security of Israel are an element of the U.S. foreign policy. This is not a new policy. But in recent months it passed the acid test. The United States has never provided major arms assistance to the State of Israel. Other countries have done

A776

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

February 18

no other asset, except human leadership, in keeping this city prosperous. To build for the future, we must make sure that Love Field continues to be second to none.

Out of line

United States-Latin American Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Record three short articles which deal primarily with United States-Latin American relations, including our Alliance for Progress assistance program.

These articles are written by Mr. Fred A. Orleans, a noted international lawyer of San Antonio, Tex., and an authority on Latin American affairs. He has lived in Mexico and other Latin American countries for a number of years and has a thorough knowledge of their problems. He is a member of the American Society of International Law, the Inter-American Bar Association, the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association, the Mexican Academy of International Law, and other organizations. Mr. Orleans is also known as an economist, a writer, and a lecturer.

The articles were written over the past couple of months. Although some of the events, especially those pertaining to Cuba, have undergone considerable change in policy and attitude, the views expressed by Mr. Orleans are still timely. I call particular attention to his article on the Agency for International Development.

(From the Past Commander)

THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
(By Fred A. Orleans)

In my article "A Latin American Program," which appeared in the U.S. Congressional Record of June 5, 1962, I indicated that it is both extremely difficult as well as highly unnecessary to attempt to formulate a completely new Latin American program since it must be recognized that the Alliance for Progress as well as the provisions of the Act for International Development of 1961, in principle, provide a potentially successful formula. In my aforementioned article I touched upon some phases of the Act for International Development, but did not attempt a complete analysis of same due to space limitations.

At this time I would like to attempt to make my readers a little better acquainted with some of the things being done by the Agency for International Development (AID). As part of the technical assistance program administered by AID in developing nations of the world, a contract was awarded to a U.S. firm to provide hospital planning consultant services for two Alliance for Progress hospital projects in Panama, a 3-year contract to Iowa State University to help Uruguay modernize its agriculture, a program to improve the health of people living in the distressed States of northeast Brazil through the construction of small hospitals and large outpatient clinics, a program in Central America to make available to 800,000

first- and second-grade public school children in five Central American Republics free readers for the 1963 school year. These are but a few of the many and varied functions being performed by the AID.

Recently an investment guarantee agreement was concluded with Venezuela making that country the 18th Latin American country to institute the investment guarantee program. Under the provisions of the agreement, the United States, through AID, may now issue investment guarantees of all types for new U.S. investment projects in Venezuela contributing to the economic development of that country. An agreement was signed with Colombia through which AID would make available \$30 million when Colombia's proposed exchange reforms are formally adopted, and another \$30 million after steps are taken to carry out a fiscal and monetary stabilization program. Funds loaned by AID would finance imports of essential goods and services from the United States and repayment will be in dollars over a period of 40 years. This agreement with Colombia is an example of the new approach to U.S. overseas foreign-aid operations through which loans which are repayable are made on a selective basis instead of the indiscriminate giveaway of funds complained of by critics of foreign aid programs.

There are those who have been impatient by the apparent slowness of AID moving ahead in certain fields. It should be pointed out that since its activation in November 1961, AID has operated under internal orders and regulations derived primarily from its predecessors. Recently AID has launched a comprehensive examination of operating techniques and procedures in order to revise internal orders and regulations to enable the speeding up of the agency's programs and lead to the improvement and modernization of its operating procedures.

The administrative personnel of AID, in my opinion, is constantly improving. David Bell, the new Administrator is a well qualified and extremely competent individual. Efforts are constantly being directed toward the encouragement of greater participation by private enterprise in foreign economic development. AID favors joint-venture type investments with local capital since this type of enterprise is most likely to result in a transfer of entrepreneurial, technical and management skills to the country itself. In taking this position, AID is in accord with the views I expressed in the Congressional Record of March 21, 1962, in my "Antidote to Nationalism in Latin America" when I stated that "one of the strongest answers to the loud clamor of the nationalist in every Latin American country is joint ventures." An Assistant Administrator of AID, Mr. Seymour M. Peyser, heads the new Office of Development Finance and Private Enterprise. Mr. Peyser has long sought the participation of private enterprise in development projects abroad and has in the past called for a partnership in economic development between AID and private enterprise.

Space does not permit me to cover at this time more phases of the operations of AID but I have attempted to present a limited picture of the vast scope of this agency's operations and its firm desire to effectively perform a service in the best interests of our country in trying to obtain the maximum benefit for the United States as well as the aided nation, in our overseas aid programs.

(From the Past Commander, Nov. 1, 1962)

SELF-DETERMINATION

(By Fred A. Orleans)

In October of this year while I was in Mexico City, Dr. Edmund Gaspar, Secretary General of the Assembly of European Captive Nations, arrived in Mexico in the last stop on

a Latin American tour. The assembly is made up of delegates from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania. Dr. Gaspar, an exile from Communist Hungary, stated that Mexico has long been a champion of self-determination and a foe of colonial rule and he called upon the government of Mexico to speak out in the United Nations against Russian colonialism in Eastern Europe.

Dr. Gaspar pointed out that his group was asking for the same thing now being given the peoples of Africa, namely freedom. He further stated that while the United Nations is working to end colonial rule in other parts of the world, it is ignoring Europe. He attributed this policy of the UN to its fear of causing friction and heating up the cold war, but pointed out that it is the captivity of the people of Eastern Europe which is the main cause of the cold war. Dr. Gaspar very ably indicated that his group is not making outrageous demands but merely asking what the Soviet Union asks in areas ruled by colonial powers: namely, free elections, participation of political parties, and the freeing of political prisoners. He further stated that when the delegates of Canada to the United Nations proposed the Soviet Union apply these principles to the countries it rules, Khrushchev took off his shoes and pounded on the table. Dr. Gaspar called for Mexico's support for a move in the United Nations to investigate Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe, and declared that no nation can raise its voice more clearly in favor of self-determination than can Mexico, historically a champion of freedom and independence.

The issue has become so obscure that it can now be asked as to exactly what the U.S. policy is toward the captive nations of Eastern Europe and does the United States feel that these nations are entitled to self-determination or do the "go soft" proponents of U.S. foreign policy want the American people to forget that Russia forcibly occupies numerous countries in Europe that once were independent nations; that these countries are not and never have been historically a part of the Soviet Union but countries which have their own national heritage, speak their own languages, enjoy their own customs, and are not willingly a part of the Soviet state, but are forced to submit to Russian occupation through military force.

To the long list of countries which have lost their independence to the ravenous Russian bear has recently been added Cuba in our own hemisphere and the question still remains unanswered as to just when the United States will take a definite position in this all-important matter of self-determination. The continuous indeterminate U.S. policy toward captive nations and captive people leave these people with no hope and no beacon of light to lead them back to their national sovereignty and independence.

(From the Past Commander, Dec. 1, 1962)
UNITED STATES MUST ADOPT A DOCTRINE OF SELF-PRESERVATION

(By Fred A. Orleans)

An analysis of current developments relating to Cuba brings into sharp focus the continuing need by the United States for a "Doctrine of Self-Preservation." Just what has the U.S. Government proclaimed with much fanfare as its Cuba policy? This new policy, from present indications seems to be twofold and is apparently based on a dismantling of the nuclear rocket bases which have been set up in Cuba over the past year and discontinuance by the Communist bloc of shipping offensive weapons into Cuba. Past dealings with the Communists over the years and recently termi-

nating with the U.S. experience in Laos, the present little war going on in Vietnam and the Red Chinese invasion of the borders of their "friends," the Indians, should give some clear indication of the value of a Communist agreement.

Although a step has been made in the right direction, if this step is all the United States intends to do with relations to the Cuban situation, then, in my estimation, we have taken a very weak and dangerous position on Cuba. I assume that in any solution of the Cuban problem, the United States will not overlook the fact that Cuba is occupied by not only Russian technicians, but admittedly by Communists from other Red bloc nations including Red China. If some of the Russian technicians leave, the status quo is still maintained with little change. If the medium range missile bases are dismantled, the mobile short range bases can still exist well concealed in the inaccessible regions of the country. What, if anything, will be done about the "fishing base" being built for Russian submarines and vessels spying on U.S. rocket tests? What will be done about the guerrillas and arms being exported from Cuba to every country in the Western Hemisphere?

A solution to the Cuban problem which does not include the above and other points too numerous to enumerate at this time, is no solution at all. If the United States calls for nothing but the dismantling of nuclear bases in Cuba and discontinuance of shipment of offensive weapons into that country, we have taken a very weak and dangerous position. We must call for nothing short of the complete elimination of the Communist menace in Cuba and the Western Hemisphere, and we cannot afford to continue the perpetual process of negotiating and compromising with the Communists which will only end when there is nothing further to negotiate or compromise.

In the middle of 1961 in my "United States Needs a Doctrine of Self-Preservation" which subsequently appeared in the U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I pointed out that the advances of communism must be stopped immediately and neither the United States nor our friends in the Western Hemisphere can wait any longer. In the war we are currently fighting against communism, the Russians are unlikely to send troops to any Latin American country. Their blueprint for taking over the Latin American nations is through subversion from within, then arming the government friendly to them with guns, tanks, planes needed to maintain power. Communists send technicians of all types, but not actually troops in uniform. This leaves the United States out on a limb and brings into sharp focus the need of a new doctrine to replace the outdated, obsolete, and inoperable Monroe Doctrine.

The Russians have set the precedent in their actions toward Hungary in 1956 on the basis that a hostile, non-Communist government in Hungary would constitute a threat to the actual security of Russia. This, in effect, brings into force a new doctrine—the doctrine of self-preservation.

The United States, sooner or later, will have to take whatever steps deemed necessary to eliminate any threat to its security in the Western Hemisphere or face the ultimate danger of being completely isolated.

History has proven time after time that weakness and concessions only lead to the war they are intended to avert, as demonstrated by the classical example of Chamberlain at Munich.

This is not the time for brave words, but the time for brave deeds. This is the time to demonstrate the courage which made America great. This is the time to prove that America can speak softly, but is again carrying a big stick and is prepared to use it.

Panama Requested Canal Annuities 50 Years in Advance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the days before World War II, when the flow of political news from China was normal, there were many reports of Chinese warlords extorting the payment of taxes far in advance. Little did I then expect to see the time when comparable exactions would be attempted in the Western Hemisphere.

Documents published by the United States in December 1962 reveal that on January 31, 1941, the Ambassador of Panama in Washington officially asked that Panama Canal annuities be paid for 50 years in advance.

The following news story from the December 17, 1962, edition of the Star and Herald of Panama, Republic of Panama, is commended for reading by every Member of the Congress.

STATE DEPARTMENT DOCUMENTS REVEAL REPUBLIC OF PANAMA ASKED IN 1941 FOR 50-YEAR ADVANCE OF ANNUITIES

WASHINGTON.—U.S. documents published today said the Republic of Panama asked the United States in 1941 to advance to Panama, for the next 50 years, the annuities paid under the Panama Canal Treaty.

The proposition came at a time the United States was seeking use of additional lands, during the early part of 1941, for defense of the Panama Canal.

The annuity at that time was \$450,000 a year. It has since been raised to \$1,900,000 yearly.

The State Department published documents dealing with diplomatic relations with some of the American Republics in 1941.

Sumner Welles, then Under Secretary of State, said the Ambassador of Panama called on him on January 31, 1941. Carlos M. Brin was mentioned in another document as Ambassador of Panama about that time.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Welles said, felt the United States-Panama Treaty set forth clearly an obligation to make available to the Canal Zone authorities sites outside the zone if required for the defense of the canal.

Welles said he told the Panamanian Ambassador of Roosevelt's views and the suggestion that because "the world situation was grave" speed was important in obtaining use of the sites.

"Finally," Welles reported in a memorandum of his conversation "the President (Roosevelt) requested me to say that when Panama had in this manner complied with the treaty obligations, this Government would be very glad to consider any suggestions for further cooperation between Panama and the United States which Panama desired to present."

"The Ambassador argued at very great length," Welles said.

He added that he told him that when the United States-Panama Treaty of 1936 was ratified "the then Government of Panama, through its official representatives, had informed me that Panama believed that all of its just aspirations had been fully met. I said it would be an intolerable situation if, with every new administration that came into power in Panama this Government found itself required to pay vast sums to

Panama in the nature of new concessions as a means of persuading Panama to carry out her treaty obligations.

"The Ambassador then blandly made the suggestion that the United States advance to Panama all of the canal annuities for the next 50 years. The Ambassador said that in this way the American bondholders could all be paid off and Panama would be able to relieve her economic situation. I said that this situation to my mind was inconceivable and that I could not comprehend the reference to the economic situation of Panama since, to my knowledge, Panama was the only 1 of the 21 American Republics which today was in a highly prosperous situation and that this was due entirely to the work on the canal."

The land sites, of size and number not outlined in the published documents, were provided by Panama within a few weeks, and negotiations were then concluded on various concessions to Panama by the United States, including certain construction and maintenance, and an agreement to seek legislation to cede to Panama certain lands of the Panama Railroad.

"Shifting Sands"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to place in the Record a very fine article entitled "Shifting Sands" by Dr. Cabel J. King, Sr., editor-emeritus of the Florida Times-Union. Dr. King's comments appeared in the February 12, 1963, issue of the Florida Times-Union, and I think they will be of interest to my colleagues.

Dr. King has dealt effectively with a matter of serious import to Florida and to all coastline areas. This is a difficult problem with which to deal, but it may be of interest to point out that a project is now being discussed between my office and representatives of the University of Florida and of the Department of the Interior for research activities designed to help control beach erosion.

The article follows:

SHIFTING SANDS

(By Dr. Caleb J. King, Sr.)

The Trustees of the Internal Improvement Fund, realizing the importance of the conservation of the Florida shores, have released funds to complete a study of ways and means of preserving this asset.

Florida has been fighting with its back to the wall for generations against the inroads of nature upon the long stretches of sandy ocean beaches which are one of the top factors in the building of this commonwealth into one of greatness.

The chief good that has come from this tireless struggle, however, has been to keep alive the hope for an eventual victory. The storms have made their frequent visits as the decades have come and gone, and shifted the sands along the shorelines into deep cuts and gradually pushed those lines deeper and deeper inland.

But the fighting forces are making increasing headway these days toward gaining the upper hand.

We see something comparable to the turn now underway on a statewide basis in what

Committee Meetings

MILITARY POSTURE

Committee on Armed Services: Met in executive session regarding U.S. military posture. Heard testimony from Fred Korth, Secretary of Navy; Gen. David M. Shoup, Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps; and Adm. G. W. Anderson, Jr., Chief of Naval Operations. Hearings continue Tuesday, February 19, in executive session.

BANKING

Committee on Banking and Currency: Heard a briefing by James J. Saxon, Comptroller of the Currency, accompanied by other members of his staff. Briefings continue Tuesday, February 19.

EDUCATION

Committee on Education and Labor: General and Special Subcommittees on Education held a joint meeting on H.R. 3000, to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunity in the Nation. Heard testimony from a public witness. Hearings continue Tuesday, February 19.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Committee on Education and Labor: General Subcommittee on Education heard testimony from Stuart L.

Udall, Secretary of the Interior, and various public witnesses, on H.R. 1890, to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps. Hearings continue Tuesday, February 19.

COMMUNISM—LATIN AMERICA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs held a hearing on Communist subversion in Latin America. Testimony was given in open and executive session by Edwin M. Martin, Assistant Secretary of State, following which testimony was given in executive session by Raymond L. Thurston, U.S. Ambassador to Haiti, and C. Allan Stewart, U.S. Ambassador to Venezuela.

TAXES

Committee on Ways and Means: Heard testimony from Kermit Gordon, Director, Bureau of the Budget, on the President's tax recommendations. Hearings continue Tuesday, February 19.

ANNOUNCEMENT—DEBT LIMIT

Committee on Ways and Means: Announced that public hearings will start on February 27 on the President's request for continuation of the \$308 billion public debt ceiling through January 30, 1963.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19

(All meetings are open unless otherwise designated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services, executive, to hear Secretary of Defense McNamara begin briefings on U.S. military programs, 10 a.m., 212 Old Senate Office Building.

Committee on Commerce, Communications Subcommittee, to continue its hearings on the operations of Telstar and Relay, the first communications satellites, 10 a.m., 5110 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on S. 2, proposed Water Resources Research Act, 10 a.m., 3110 New Senate Office Building.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior, executive, 10 a.m., H-307, U.S. Capitol Building.

Subcommittee on Defense, executive, 10 a.m., H-144, U.S. Capitol Building.

Subcommittee on Independent Offices, executive, 10 a.m., H-142, U.S. Capitol Building.

Subcommittee on Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare, 10 a.m., H-163, U.S. Capitol Building.

Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, executive, 10 a.m., H-310, U.S. Capitol Building.

Subcommittee on Agriculture, executive, 1 p.m., H-305, U.S. Capitol Building.

Committee on Armed Services, executive, regarding U.S. military posture, 10 a.m., 313-A Cannon House Office Building.

Committee on Banking and Currency, informal briefings, 10 a.m., 1301 Longworth House Office Building.

Committee on Education and Labor, joint meeting of Special and General Subcommittees on Education, to consider H.R. 3000, re educational quality and opportunity in the Nation, 9:45 a.m., 429 Cannon House Office Building.

General Subcommittee on Education, on H.R. 1890, to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps, 2 p.m., 429 Cannon House Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, executive, briefing by John A. McCone, Director, CIA, 10:30 a.m., H-322, U.S. Capitol Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 3, executive, on pending legislation, 10 a.m., 353 Cannon House Office Building.

Committee on Ways and Means, on President's tax recommendations, 10 a.m., committee room, Longworth House Office Building.

briefing free

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 2255-2312

Bills Introduced: 23 bills and 7 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 808-830; S.J. Res. 44-47; and S. Con. Res. 18-20.

Pages 2257-2258

Nominations: The following nominations were received: 2 civilian, including that of Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois, to be U.S. Representative on the Trusteeship Council of the U.N.; 2 judicial; 1 Coast Guard; 29 Coast and Geodetic Survey; 55 Public Health Service; and numerous Air Force.

Pages 2322-2324

Legislative Program: Majority leader announced that on Tuesday, February 19, Senate will consider the reported nominations on the executive calendar; the slates of committee membership, including chairmanships thereof; and a continuing resolution to pay staffs of certain Senate committees.

Page 2283

Program for Tuesday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 1:56 p.m. until noon Tuesday, February 19, when its program will be as announced in item above.

Pages 2283, 2322

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITES

Committee on Commerce: The Communications Subcommittee began hearings in connection with the operations of Telstar and Relay, the first communications satellites, having as its witnesses Rosel H. Hyde, Acting Chairman, and T. A. M. Craven, member, both of the Federal Communications Commission; James Dingman, executive vice president, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; and Eugene F. O'Neill, director, satellite communications laboratories, Bell Telephone Laboratories.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

CUBA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on International Organization Affairs met in executive session with Richard Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, who testified and answered questions with regard to the U.N. Special Fund project for Cuban agricultural development.

Subcommittee recessed subject to call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 49 public bills, H.R. 3844-3892; 20 private bills, H.R. 3893-3912; and 6 resolutions, H.J. Res. 253-255, H. Con. Res. 98, and H. Res. 258 and 259, were introduced.

Pages 2349-2351

Washington's Farewell Address: Agreed to a special order providing for the reading of George Washington's Farewell Address on Thursday, February 21. Representative Burton was subsequently designated by the Speaker to read the Farewell Address to the House.

Page 2325

Committee To Sit: The Committee on Banking and Currency was granted permission to sit today and February 19, 25, and 26, during general debate of the House sessions.

Page 2325

Consent Calendar: The Consent Calendar, consisting of two bills, H.R. 199, to provide additional compensation for veterans having service-connected disability of deafness of both ears, and H.R. 214, to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords with resulting complete aphonia, was called and both bills were passed over without prejudice.

Page 2332

Agricultural Investigations: The House adopted, with amendments, H. Res. 38, authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to conduct certain studies and investigations.

Pages 2332-2333

Program for Thursday: Adjourned at 12:43 p.m. until Thursday, February 21, at 12 o'clock noon.

D63

lites, it is estimated, spend \$1 billion a year on aid.

Britain and France concentrate on helping their former colonies, where they still have strong ties of trade and culture. Japan gives most of its aid to southeast Asia, some of it as reparations for World War II damage to occupied nations.

West Germany, with no recent colonial past, is more flexible in its programs, granting aid to any nation outside the Communist bloc that can show a need, and attaching few strings.

The Common Market Development Fund, which started this year, may be a means of extending this flexibility. France already has made plans to channel more of its aid to Africa through this Fund. The six member nations of the Market will contribute \$703 million for a 5-year period.

FRANCE GIVES ESTIMATE

France estimates it has spent \$7 billion in aid to its oversea territories, now mostly independent, since 1946, and says it devotes more of its gross national product to aid, 2.41 percent, than any other nation. Britain publishes no comparable figures. West Germany says it has given out \$3.8 billion in development aid in the same period.

Besides the United States, France, Britain, West Germany, and Japan provide most of the men and money for these projects. But smaller nations like Israel, Austria, and the Scandinavian countries are playing an important part.

Israel sends experts to many African nations and Iran, passing along the knowledge it has gained in building industry and growing crops in the desert. Denmark hopes to spend 1 percent of its gross national product on aid soon, and has a plan of private fund-raising matched by Government grants.

Austria's program shows the direct link between American aid to Europe and European aid to the underdeveloped nations.

Since 1961, it has agreed to turn over an essential part of its remaining Marshall plan funds to poorer nations. Last year, it lent \$5 million of its \$40 million of Marshall plan money to India, and plans to repeat this year.

CUBA The Russians Are Still There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, never before Cuba has the United States blundered not only militarily and politically but morally as well. The loss of Cuba nearly matches the loss of China, but even China was not protected by the Monroe Doctrine.

In 140 years of the Monroe Doctrine even as mighty a dictator as Napoleon III of France was sent packing from Mexico. But not only did Cuba become Communist, Khrushchev and the Russians walked in and stayed. Discussions of 4 or 40 missiles remaining on Cuba obscure this fundamental fact.

American foreign policy in the Caribbean based on the Monroe Doctrine has been replaced by television public relations, news management, rewritten history, guilty consciences and ransom payments.

Before the Cuban problem can be morally and resolutely tackled, past errors have to be admitted, the blame squarely accepted. Cannot this courage be expected from the executive department?

Instead of weak alibis and sneaky stories, Americans are interested in where we go from here.

The following editorial is from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

DIPLOMACY BY RANSOM

Now that the fantastic barter of \$53 million in goods (plus \$2,900,000 in cash) for the 1,113 Bay of Pigs prisoners has been completed, what do the American people think of this weird transaction which sounds more like Homer's account of the Trojan war than the 20th century?

Time was when every American schoolboy thrilled with pride on first hearing "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

Diplomacy by ransom has now become an American policy and has been increasing as Communist regimes returned to barbarism. Chinese residing in Hong Kong or California are probably still paying regularly just to keep relatives alive in Red China prison camps.

In 1951, the United States itself paid \$123,605 to Red Hungary for the return of four of our airmen who had been forced to land on its soil.

Castro's price was even greater than that \$30,000 per man, although the actual cost can never be determined in such a complicated transaction. Wholesale prices and retail prices would have to be figured, tax deductions considered, services rendered but not charged for included.

Never in all history, we can be sure, has a mighty nation forked over so much to a little island neighbor to spring its own citizens from the dungeons of a bearded madman.

Apart from that, what do the American people think about how their Government, pretending not to have any part in it, surreptitiously manipulated the transaction?

When talk of ransoming the prisoners was revived several months ago, it became obvious that something big was going on. The committee which sought to raise the \$28 million first demanded had given up when it couldn't come even close to it.

If, all of a sudden, \$53 million was going to be raised where little part of it could be found before, everyone knew the hand of the U.S. Government was bound to be in it somewhere.

So it was, as now we know.

With the administration afraid to pay blackmail directly because of public and congressional objection, it apparently pulled every string in its vast arsenal of power to get all the goods and money needed contributed by private citizens and corporations.

(Possibly the administration got the idea when it employed Department of Justice pressure to roll back steel prices in 1961 without any legal justification for such action.)

Arranging first with Internal Revenue to permit the contributions to be channeled through the American Red Cross where blackmail could be labeled "charity" for tax deduction purposes, it next got officials in various departments of the Government to line up likely prospects for everything Castro wanted.

Drugs and medical supplies constituted the bulk of his demands, and, boy, oh boy, how the pharmaceutical industry had been softened up for this operation.

The Kefauver committee had been pounding away at it incessantly with its charges of exorbitant drug prices. The thalidomide scare had brought forth public demand for

the most stringent pure food and drugs law.

Much better than a blackjack would be a telephone call from the Department of Justice to get contributions from these sources.

Next in importance to the ransom effort was the transportation industry, always subject to Federal regulation and always having antitrust laws hanging over its head. The enormous supplies contributed by the drug manufacturers would, of course, have to be assembled and transported for free.

The railroads, the truckers, the airlines and shipping companies responded to the Department of Justice's call just as generously as the pharmaceutical industry.

More than 600,000 pounds of cargo was flown by eight domestic airlines, without cost. Nineteen railroads provided 80 boxcars on a special run, without cost. Eight trucking firms moved 420,000 pounds, without cost. Fifteen shipping companies teamed up to provide the ship to move the cargo to Cuba, without cost.

As for the \$2,900,000 in cash which Castro demanded at the last moment, its sources haven't been disclosed. It is not difficult to guess that most, if not all of it, came from firms doing business with the Government who were scarcely in a position to say no to their best customer, regardless of their personal feelings toward the ransom.

Attorney General Bobby Kennedy, however, is largely credited with raising the money, which is said to have included a \$1 million contribution from one man, a \$1 million loan from another.

The American people, we know, are as glad as they can be that the Cuban prisoners have been freed.

They well deserve the accolade of this Nation, which President and Mrs. Kennedy gave them in that moving ceremony in the Orange Bowl at Miami Saturday—the admiration of people the whole world over who prize liberty above all else.

As freedom fighters, they had sailed off with high hope and courage to liberate their homeland—with the blessings of the U.S. Government, which had largely arranged the venture.

And they had been led to the slaughter from Castro's few planes because the air cover they had been promised was not forthcoming from the mightiest air force in the world.

Even so, this was a shameful price the country had to pay for the President's mistake, and this was a shameful way in which our Government skirted its own laws to pay it.

Tides of Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 17, I had the privilege of speaking before the Lithuanian American Council of Greater New York, on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Lithuanian Independence Day falls between Lincoln's and Washington's Birthdays, and should be remembered by all Americans as an occasion when people in another land proclaimed their independence from oppression and tyranny.

A766

In my remarks, I tried to outline some aspects of Lithuanian history and to describe their long struggle for independence. This history will be interesting to my colleagues:

TIDES OF TYRANNY

(By Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY)

For those of us gathered here today and for the more than 2 million Americans of Lithuanian descent, February 18 is indeed a historic occasion, a date which celebrates heroism in the past, and which symbolizes hope for the future. For 45 years Lithuanians whenever they might be have together recalled with patriotic pride that day in 1918 when individual valor brought national victory to a small by ancient land long dominated by despicable despotism. In view of the significance of that day and the solemnity of this occasion, it is indeed a distinct honor for me to join with you in commemorating the 45th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence.

The tyranny which enslaves Lithuania today completely overshadows the tyranny which oppressed that country in the past. But we should not forget that the heroic history of Lithuania is at the same time a tragic epic of foreign aggressions repeated so often that, when we consider this history, we might well speak of the incessant "tides of tyranny." February 16, 1918, marks the greatest chapter in this saga, a chapter in which those evil tides emerged from beneath the oppressive waters of tyranny. Today I propose to review briefly this epic struggle of Lithuania to maintain her identity and to defend her independence against centuries of aggression and oppression. Only when we recall these centuries of struggle which produced the victory of 1918, only then do we recognize the full significance of February 18. And only then can we realize the magnitude of the tremendous task which is ours today, the task of turning back and stemming forever these "tides of tyranny."

Lithuania is endowed with two fatal attractions: strategic location and natural wealth. Situated on the shores of the Baltic midway between Berlin and Moscow, Lithuania is a rich land of farms, forests, and lakes—more than 2,000 of them I understand. The very first mention of Lithuania in recorded history—made by Tacitus, the famous Roman historian—was in praise of Lithuanian farming. The fertile soil, the timber, the outlet on the Baltic—each was by itself treasure enough to motivate foreign aggression against Lithuania.

The primary perpetrator of such aggression has always been and remains today just one country: Russia. Long before the Lithuanian tribes were forged into one nation the country was struggling against domination by its Russian neighbors from the east. Finally in the 14th century the people of Lithuania began to turn back these early waves of aggression, waves which were but an ominous warning of later tides to come.

By the end of the 14th century, Lithuania had driven the Russians back to Moscow and had secured for itself the power necessary to protect its territories and traditions. Following the dynastic union with Poland, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was a marvelous and mighty state stretching from the Baltic Sea in the north to the Black Sea in the south. Within these boundaries the old and rich culture of the Lithuanian people attained brilliant heights, heights which it would attain again only after similar suffering and struggle. This comparative calm, this peaceful prosperity lasted little more than a century.

By 1500 the Russian tide had ebbed and was now again sweeping back across the northern and central plains of Europe. For 40 of the 90 years between 1492 and 1562 Lithuania found itself at war with the Mus-

covite aggressors. The czars alleged that Russia desired only an outlet on the Baltic Sea; however, after Peter the Great had taken Riga from Sweden and had built his own window on the Baltic at St. Petersburg, the Russian rulers showed that their appetite for aggression was far from satisfied.

In 1795 this aggression came quickly and brutally to the surface: the shameful third partition of Poland also became the fateful third of our many tides of tyranny, tyranny which was to now completely engulf Lithuania and enslave its people for 123 years.

Not that the people of Lithuania willingly or weakly succumbed to such oppression. Throughout the course of their long history they have fought fiercely to overthrow the repressive rule of the ruthless Russian czars. In 1812 Lithuania experienced a mere moment of relative freedom as Napoleon advanced against Moscow. The fate of that historic campaign has been recorded with stark simplicity upon a monument which still stands in Vilnius. On one side the inscription reads "Napoleon Bonaparte passed this way in 1812 with 400,000 men"; on the other side it continues "Napoleon Bonaparte passed his way in 1812 with 9,000 men." But within 20 years of that setback the winds of freedom were again attempting to sweep back the tides of oppression. In that year of 1831 Lithuanians lent active aid to Poland in a revolution against the heavy hand of Russian reaction and only the brute force of 150,000 Russian troops was capable of quelling their spirited struggle. Thereafter oppression was increased and intensified: Lithuanian lands were confiscated and then delivered into the hands of Russian nobles, the University of Vilnius closed, and finally Russians were everywhere designated to control the government, the army and the church.

When revolution erupted for a third time in 1863-64, the czar finally realized that military might had failed to conquer Lithuania's resistance. Suppressions, hangings, exiles to Siberia, czarist brutality failed to quell the indomitable love of freedom and self-determination of the gallant Lithuanian peoples.

World War I and the Russian revolution furnished the long-sought opportunity for which generations had been striving with such courage and fortitude. With the Proclamation of Independence at Vilnius on February 16, 1918, and the treaty of peace of July 12, 1920, which accorded full recognition as an independent state, Lithuania reemerged to take her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

During her short-lived independence the country grew, prospered, and left an indelible influence for good upon the onrushing course of world events. Her domestic economy and foreign trade expanded mightily. Long-needed social services were instituted, her cultural life thrived under peaceful surroundings. Education once again became a reality for her people and agriculture her principal industry greatly benefited.

But Lithuanian freedom was tragically shortlived. For in June of 1940 the armies of Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany flagrantly violated the canons of international law and the rights of man and brutally subjected the Lithuanian people to a tyranny as cold-blooded and remorseless as any act of aggression committed in this century of total war. The tragic events that followed are too well known ever to be forgotten.

The soul of a proud and great nation lives on beneath the brutal yoke of Soviet tyranny. It lives in the hearts of Lithuanian countrymen who cling to the motherland in the face of Communist enslavement. It lives in our own country where the brave liberty-loving peoples of Lithuanian ancestry have contributed so much to our own national experience and have given so tirelessly of themselves to the communities in which they live. It lives on in the richness and variety

of the oldest living European language. It continues to live through the darkness of Soviet oppression keeping a prayerful vigil at the ramparts of national destiny sustaining the light of liberty which must never be extinguished and which will once again burn brightly to herald the arrival of a new dawn of freedom for Lithuania. Only then, will the oppressive "tides of tyranny" be turned back forever.

Observance of 45th Anniversary of Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 17, I had the pleasure of addressing a rally of Lithuanians of the Detroit area, and also had the high honor of speaking along with Julius Smetonas, the son of the first and only President of the Republic of Lithuania.

This heroic country, swallowed by Russia in 1940 and forced to exist under Communist rule, has many patriots throughout the world struggling to again some day see their homeland free.

I would like to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the resolution adopted Sunday, on observance of the 45th anniversary of Lithuania's independence; a proclamation by Detroit Mayor Jerome Cavanagh designating February 16 as Republic of Lithuania Day, and a proclamation by the Governor of Michigan, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian nation freed itself from Tsarist Russia domination and proclaimed its independence as a free democratic republic which was ultimately recognized by all of the great powers of the world; and

Whereas during its 22 years of freedom and independence from 1918 to 1940, Lithuania proved itself as a free and independent nation; and

Whereas in spite of agreements to the contrary, the Soviet Union forcibly incorporated Lithuania into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, thereby depriving the Lithuanian people of their basic human rights and private property; deported those who opposed the sovietization of their homeland and continue the enslavement of Lithuania and the exploitation of its people to this very day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we hereby rededicate ourselves to the cause of liberating Lithuania from the yoke of communism so that she may once again rejoin the family of free nations; and be it further

Resolved, That we express our sincerest gratitude to the Administration and Congress of the United States of America for the continued nonrecognition of the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union and for the numerous contributions to, and sympathy for, the cause of Lithuania's never-ending battle to regain its freedom and independence; and be it further

Resolved, That we petition the President and Secretary of State of the United States of America to direct the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to confront the members of that august body with the facts regarding the Soviet colonization of Estonia, Lat-

Cuba
Fight U.N. Cuban Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I submit the following editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of February 15, 1963.

Today on the floor of the House of Representatives, I have discussed the recent United Nations proposal to give \$1.5 million of aid to Communist Cuba.

In addition, I wish to point up my disapproval of the situation concerning UNESCO which is discussed in this editorial. As indicated, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization has published a booklet written by two Russians which denounces "colonial oppression" and describes the Soviet Union as a "brotherhood of free and equal peoples." This is an additional example of the United States supporting agencies of the United Nations—in this case the United States pays approximately one-third of UNESCO's budget—which are carrying out policies which are not in the interest of the American people. This instance is particularly notable in that the press has so recently been revealing the notorious Soviet persecution of Russian Jews.

This Nation is looked to as the champion of freedom by the captive peoples of the world. We must not permit a situation to continue whereby we are financing the publication of lies about the free world on the one hand and the suppression of truth about Soviet persecution on the other.

The editorial follows:

FIGHT U.N. CUBAN POLICY

The United States is being boxed into a ridiculous position regarding Cuba.

A demand that Russia get its troops out of Cuba because they "poison the atmosphere" was voiced by Secretary of State Dean Rusk in a Los Angeles speech Wednesday.

On the same day, his office in Washington was forced to note with regret that the United Nations Special Fund is going ahead with a \$1.5 million agricultural aid project to Cuba over U.S. objections. The United States provides 40 percent of the fund's expenses.

This Nation is in a state of undeclared war with Cuba. Fidel Castro has confiscated more than \$1 billion worth of American property and has not paid one dime in compensation, as required by civilized standards. He is an international pirate and is exporting insurrection to other Latin countries. The United States has cut off trade with Cuba in items that could help the economy, and has tried to discourage other free nations from trading with Cuba.

Must the United States now stand by helplessly while an agency of the U.N. that could not exist without American support helps Castro build up his economy?

The project is an insult to America.

In another area of U.N. activity, another insult to America and the free world has been revealed. The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

(UNESCO) has published a booklet written by two Russians and which denounces "colonial oppression" and describes the Soviet Union as a "brotherhood of free and equal peoples." (At the moment, Russia is notoriously persecuting Jews.) The United States pays one-third of UNESCO's budget.

When the U.N. was founded the United States agreed to pick up a large share of its expenses because the United States was comparatively wealthy and unscarred by World War II as so many other nations were. And the U.N. was born out of an American ideal, peace with justice.

But it was never contemplated by Americans that they would be used to finance activities that are directly counter to America's best interests and foreign policies. The United States may not always be able to have its way on U.N. policies, but it certainly should not feel obliged to finance specific anti-American policies.

If the United States continues to support the U.N. Special Fund after the defiance of U.S. views on Cuba, Congress would well be justified in cutting off any funds for the Special Fund. No other nation in the world would go on supporting a group that so blatantly and cynically ignored its views. (Russia, for example, refused to support the U.N. action in the Congo.)

The incident also is an indication that other nations do not take seriously America's view on Cuba. It's time to impress them differently. The United States must get back to the militant attitude on Cuba it exhibited last October. What, for example, does Rusk propose to do to back up his demand that Russian troops get out of Cuba? America awaits a White House answer on this and the U.N. Special Fund.

The Great Bay State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, both on the National and the State level we hear repeatedly that the proper amount of promotion in the field of tourism can be a tremendous boost to our economy. We in the Federal Government are extremely happy at the emphasis this administration is placing in the U.S. Travel Service's drive to bring visitors to this country. For a long time there was a tendency at all levels of government to treat tourism as sort of a stepchild.

I was happy recently, along with other Members of Congress to visit the "Travel America" Auto Show at the District of Columbia Armory and to see there the exhibits of a number of States promoting the attractions of their particular areas. I was especially proud to see the outstanding exhibit of my own Commonwealth of Massachusetts. This exhibit arranged by the Massachusetts Department of Commerce, and staffed by a talented group, including a very lovely young lady, Miss Gayle Pope, who is "Miss Massachusetts." I commend the members of the Bay State delegation and both the House and the Senate for the cooperation they gave to the Commonwealth in connection with this show. I was also happy to note that the Gov-

ernor of Massachusetts, Endicott Peabody, took time from a busy schedule in Washington to appear at the show.

More promotions of this nature will mean more visitors for the various States with the end result that the entire economy will benefit. As a son of Massachusetts, I want to state I was very proud of all the participants in this exhibit.

Cuba
Aiding the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish it were possible for all Americans to read the editorial pages of the Washington Evening Star of last Friday, February 15. Appearing on those pages are three excellent commentaries—a Star editorial and columns by William S. White and David Lawrence—on the Cuban aid project of the United Nations Special Fund and the pro-Communist booklet issued by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Few Americans, I am sure, will be fooled by President Kennedy's feeble argument that U.S. dollars will not be used in the Cuban aid deal. The Special Fund gets 40 percent of its money from the United States. All contributions go into one pot, and to argue that our money will not be used is like saying that you can pour cream from the top of a bottle of homogenized milk.

Following are the Star editorial and the columns by Mr. White and Mr. Lawrence:

HELPING CASTRO

It's been a long time since we've read anything feebler than the disclaimers by the President and by Paul G. Hoffman with respect to the United Nations project to bolster Fidel Castro's Communist Cuba.

Mr. Kennedy brushed off the matter by telling his news conference that no U.S. dollars are going to Cuba, which is an equivocation. Mr. Hoffman, Managing Director of the U.N. Special Fund, said the same thing, and added that maybe Castro won't benefit in the long run.

Maybe not. But the undeniable fact is that the Special Fund, which gets 40 percent of its money from the United States, proposes to put up \$1,157,600 to be spent through the U.N. Food and Agricultural Organization to help Cuba's farm economy.

This isn't much money as things go these days. But it still is more than \$1 million, and to say they are not American dollars is to quibble about a bookkeeping transaction. As long as the United States puts up 40 percent of the Special Fund money it contributes indirectly to the U.N. Cuban investment—an investment which Mr. Hoffman has authorized on a trial basis despite reported strenuous objections from the State Department.

Meanwhile, it is disclosed that another U.N. organization, UNESCO, which gets 31.46 percent of its funds from the State Department, put up the money last year to pay for publication of a Russian-written brochure which denounces "colonialist oppression" by the Western nations and praises the Soviet

their independence, but their homeland remains under the alien yoke of Soviet communism. Whether in exile or residing in their native land, Lithuanians have set apart this day to reaffirm their devotion to the historic tradition of Lithuanian national independence. Like the Russian czars who tried to impose their way of life on this sturdy little nation before World War I, the Soviet rulers have been unable to erase the memories of Lithuanian language, culture, and religion. Lithuanians recall the congress of 200 citizens which declared a free, independent, and democratic Lithuania in 1918; they recall the civil liberties which that government guaranteed, and the peaceful and constructive role which Lithuania played in international affairs between the two world wars. The independence Lithuania achieved in 1918 marked the fulfillment of ancient aspirations, for during the Middle Ages Lithuania was a great Central European nation. We share the hope of courageous Lithuanians that the renewal of their freedom is not far off. I am proud to join my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent who yearn for national independence with political and social justice.

Wall Map of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a concurrent resolution today which, if approved by both Houses, will authorize the printing of 59,350 copies of a wall map of the United States. These maps would be prepared cooperatively by the Bureau of Land Management and Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior. Its information would also include historical data, concerning public surveys, reservations, and other appropriate dedications of land of the United States. There will be made available 43,900 copies for distribution by Members of the House of Representative, and 15,450 for Members of the Senate. The primary purpose of this resolution is to effect the congressional-type distribution on a single-sheet map. In a similar resolution approved in the 87th Congress, the dimensions of the map were larger than requested in this proposal and necessitated the use of two sheets which had to be pasted together to effect a complete map. Because of the desire of many Members to have the single-sheet type, with the information I have described, I am requesting that the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 574—87th Congress—be suspended. I have written to Secretary Udall about our desires in this matter, and if and when the Congress approves this resolution, I am advised that the Department can begin

processing and printing of this important, informative map to satisfy requests of all Members for its need.

Our Popular Pastime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have previously called the attention of the Members of the House to the unusual amount of criticism that is currently being heaped upon the heads of Members of Congress. Some of this criticism is warranted. Unfortunately, some of the criticism seems to stem from a basic lack of appreciation for our system of government with its built-in checks and balances. We live in a streamlined age; perhaps, therefore, it is only natural that some people believe that our present system of constitutional government should be streamlined in order to qualify for the space age. It is my belief that there is a far more basic reason than a simple veneration for tradition that bids us go slowly in changing the basic structure of our Government. As I have already indicated, this is not to imply that all criticism of Congressmen is merely capricious or fanciful. I believe personally that in the area of conflict of interest and also in the area of dealing with budgetary matters that some genuine reforms are needed. However, I am just as prepared to firmly defend the role of Congress as one of the three great coordinate branches of our Federal Government.

Also, I must confess to some considerable impatience with those who would condemn all Congressmen because of the faults of a few. Therefore, when I read the following editorial by Mr. Ken Smith, the very capable editor of the Rochelle New Leader, I was immensely reassured. The writer demonstrates, I think, the kind of rational and measured appreciation of the problems of Congress that are all too lacking in some of the current commentary. Therefore, I take pride in commanding the following editorial entitled, "Our Popular Pastime" to my colleagues in the House of Representatives:

OUR POPULAR PASTIME

Criticism of Congress has been a favorite American pastime almost from the time it was created by the Founding Fathers as one of the three branches of the Federal Government.

Through the years Congress has been a favorite target for jesters and has been a convenient whipping boy for those who were displeased with what the Government was doing or wasn't doing.

We admit that Congress sometimes is funnier than a comic opera and often is as irritating as a spoiled child but we are always forced to the conclusion that any Congress,

no matter how bad, is better than none at all.

Most of the responsible criticism of Congress springs from the extremely slow pace at which it moves, the almost constant necessity to compromise, the jealousies that frequently exist, the continual jockeying for political advantage and strict adherence to the seniority rule in committee chairmanships.

All of these complaints have been valid at one time or another but have made little long-range impression on Congress. The House and Senate still follow with little change the rules and traditions that were acquired during the first 100 years of the Republic.

One of the first requirements for being a Congressman is a thick skin for Congress is nearly in a position where it is criticized regardless of what it does.

If Congress quickly puts through a program of legislation asked by the administration it is a rubber stamp Congress. If it fails to do so it is an obstructionist Congress.

If it passes too many new bits of legislation it is a busybody; if the number of bills passed is small it is a do-nothing Congress.

If the Members spend considerable time on junkets or with the folks back home they are criticized for not tending to their business of law making. If they stay in Washington too long they are accused of being out of touch with the folks back home.

If they too closely follow the wishes of the people of their district they are being provincial and neglecting the general interest of their country. If they do not reflect the sentiments of their constituents they are taken to task for flaunting the will of the voters.

If they try to get all the advantages they can for their district they are pork barrelers but if they don't get them they most likely will cease to be Congressmen.

If they adhere strictly to the political party line they are party hacks but if they don't they are political mavericks.

If they yield to any pressure group they are called the captives of the lobbyists but if they oppose legislation in which a strong pressure group is interested they are branded as an enemy of the group and a foe to progress.

If they are free with Government funds they are spendthrifts but if they try to keep spending in check they are accused of putting property rights above human rights.

If they spend a lot of time debating a bill they are called a bunch of windbags but if they push legislation through with little or no debate they are accused of using steam-roller tactics.

The 88th Congress, now in session, will be subject to all the usual criticisms and few people—least of all the Congressmen—will be especially concerned.

When this country adopted a representative form of government under a written constitution it was not seeking the most efficient type of rule but rather the type that would be most responsible to the people.

By its very nature Congress is and ought to be a cross section of all the people of the United States. Senators will nearly always reflect the attitudes of their States and Representatives will mirror the people of their district.

There may be times when we think Congress should speak with one voice and reflect the national interest rather than the interest of the part of it they represent.

But until the people want to speak in one voice and submerge their own interests and desires to those of the common good there will be no unanimity in Congress. But then if the people ever reach such a high state of perfection there be little need for government in any form except in the fields of international relations and national security.

Union as "a brotherhood of free and equal peoples."

Well, as someone has said, it's a dizzy world. Mr. Hoffman claims he is confident that Congress will not take any reprisals against U.N. funds, and he may be right. For Congress has demonstrated a remarkable capacity to "take it" when it comes to shelling out American dollars for dubious ventures around the world. And so has the American taxpayer. But there must be a limit somewhere, and this aid-to-Castro foolishness ought to show us where it is.

CUBAN AID: PERVERTING THE U.N.

(By William S. White)

This country's problem in dealing with Castro Cuba has now been further bedeviled by an extraordinarily ham-handed action within the United Nations.

A U.N. suborganization called the Special Fund has chosen this untimely hour in history to award a \$1.2 million United Nations agricultural aid project to Fidel Castro. The United States of America provides 40 percent of the total financial support of this fund, of which the managing director, Paul G. Hoffman, is himself an American.

This economic assistance to Mr. Castro, though no doubt small in the great scheme of things, comes precisely at the moment when the highest American policy is directed to the economic destruction of Cuba as an open Soviet military base and a lodgment for Soviet Communist penetration in this hemisphere.

It also comes precisely at the moment when American efforts are directed to explaining to other nations in Latin America that Mr. Castro is an outlaw and that anti-Americanism is not a useful line to take up in this hemisphere. In short, this project could not possibly have been approved at a time more embarrassing to the United States and more suitable to Mr. Castro's book.

Mr. Hoffman is quoted in the curious argument that, anyhow, the money which will go to Mr. Castro will not come directly from American contributions. But this absurd and tasteless affair mocks our whole position that Castro Cuba is consistent threat to what the U.N. is supposed to be, an organization opposed to both open and covert aggression.

STATE DEPARTMENT WARNING

The very note of our State Department regretting this action calls attention to Cuba's "persistent policy of hostility toward its neighbors." It declares, moreover, that Cuba's "support of subversion throughout the hemisphere precludes the establishment there of the normal cooperative relations necessary to the implementation of a United Nations project."

Nevertheless, the thing has been implemented all the same, and with nothing more than a timid objection filed back in 1961 by the U.S. delegation to the United Nations. State Department informants privately concede that there was nothing in U.N. procedure to have prevented the United States from having demanded, in 1961 or now, that this grant to Mr. Castro be set aside.

They add that it was "apparently our conclusion"—meaning the conclusion of our U.N. delegation in New York—that we could not marshal the required two-thirds vote within the governing council which is supposed to direct the policies of the Special Fund.

NO ROLL-CALL

But it is conceded that we never at any point so much as asked for a rollcall or lobbied to raise the necessary majority.

In short, it is perfectly obvious, on the basis of State Department information, that the 17 nations supposedly running this fund are not running it at all but are leaving it to the Managing Director, Paul Hoffman. It is no less obvious that a mere salaried

bureaucracy in the U.N. is able, in this instance, to flout the central foreign policy designs of the very country that is carrying the bulk of all the financial load for the agency thus bureaucracy administers.

Finally, it is also perfectly plain that the senior people in the State Department itself are chagrined by this almost incredible episode. How long before the U.S. delegation to the U.N. under Ambassador Adlai Stevenson is made a part of the U.S. Government? How soon will it cease having a foreign policy of its own?

And how long before the U.N. right-wrongers, who presently will tolerate no criticism of it at any point for any reason, will realize that the good in this institution will not in the end survive by mere passionate refusals to see the follies that are perverting it out of all rational shape?

THE U.S. AND U.N. AID FOR CUBA—PROPOSAL TO SUSTAIN CASTRO'S REGIME CALLED TURNING POINT FOR ORGANIZATION

(By David Lawrence)

The United Nations has reached a turning point in its history. Sentiment in the United States for withdrawal from the international organization has just been given strong new impetus. For the American people will be asked through Congress to decide whether taxpayers' money shall be channeled into Cuba through the U.N. to help Fidel Castro maintain his inhumane regime. Hundreds of innocent persons have been executed by the gangster government in Havana, yet the U.N. puts its stamp of approval on such a government by furnishing funds to sustain the domestic position of a cruel dictator.

Democrats as well as Republicans have denounced the U.N.'s action on the floor of Congress.

The point is made by President Kennedy that none of the money to be spent in Cuba will come directly from the funds furnished by the United States. But funds can always be redistributed or reallocated to achieve a political objective. The fact remains that the American Government is paying a large share of the expenses of the U.N., and it is no secret that the United States is trying to help liberate the people of Cuba by putting the squeeze on the island's economy. When the U.N. flagrantly ignores the policy of the United States, it brings up the broad question of whether financial aid by American taxpayers shall be extended blindly and without any opportunity to keep the funds from being used to defeat the foreign policy of this country.

U.N. officials argue that they are not interfering in the internal politics of Cuba. But, realistically, anything that bolsters the Cuban economy is an intervention, especially at a moment when the United States is trying, by means of a shipping boycott, to weaken the Castro government and bring about its downfall.

It will be said that the United States cannot expect to influence the actions of an international organization in which it has only one vote. But neither is the American Government obligated to supply money for an organization whose projects run counter to American foreign policies.

The U.N. has been in deep financial trouble lately, and this country has helped out by paying far more than its share of the expenses of the organization. Congress, however—and not the State Department or the White House—has the final say as to how the taxpayers' money shall be loaned or given away. The U.N. bond issue had a tough time getting through Congress last year, and there are renewed expressions of doubt now even about the foreign-aid program in which the United States alone decides how to spend its money. This will cause Congress at least to examine more carefully any legislation that

would appropriate money over whose distribution this country has no control.

The argument that America, as a philanthropically minded nation, should help underdeveloped or backward countries will continue to make a certain appeal. At a time, however, when the American people are being asked to incur a Treasury deficit of more than \$20 billion, it will doubtless occur to many Members of Congress that this presents a paradox which cannot be easily explained to the voters.

The whole amount to be spent in Cuba by the U.N. for the new project of agricultural development is comparatively small—about \$1.2 million. It isn't, however, the sum allocated but the principle which bothers the American Government at this time. The State Department tried to persuade the U.N. officials that it would be an unwise move, but the protest was of no avail. Furthermore, if this project goes through, it will cause hesitation in Congress to approve all other appropriations for the benefit of the United Nations.

Coincidentally with the announcement of the pro-Castro action by the director of the U.N. special fund, a pro-Communist booklet issued by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization has come into the news. This publication extols the alleged social and political equality existing inside the Soviet Union and asserts that Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia "voluntarily joined the Soviet Union" in 1940. Everybody knows that early in World War II the Soviet army by military force seized those three countries, which were then incorporated into the Soviet Union, where they have remained ever since. This action has never been recognized by the United States, Great Britain and many other countries. The assembly of captive European nations, which is composed of political exiles from the Eastern European Communist bloc, has protested against the booklet and calls it Soviet propaganda.

On the Senate floor yesterday, Democratic whip HUBERT HUMPHREY declared that the statement in the U.N. booklet that the Baltic states had voluntarily joined the Soviet Union is pure patent nonsense. He said it was intolerable that such a report should be published by an international organization dedicated to truth and scientific knowledge.

The United Nations is surely in for trouble with American public opinion. For it develops that UNESCO, which issued the booklet, is financed nearly one-third by the people of this country and less than one-sixth by the Soviet Union. Maybe Moscow should pay the whole bill.

Textbook Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Omaha Evening World-Herald of February 6. The editorial discusses the Canadian debacle and identifies it as one of a series of unfortunate events:

TEXTBOOK EXAMPLE

This Nation's intervention in Canada's defense policy might properly be set down as a textbook example of how not to conduct foreign affairs.

As columnist Arthur Krock has pointed out, the diplomatic note which the United States sent was cleared by the White House and was tied directly to the President. It, therefore, cannot be dismissed as a blunder by underlings, which is the usual way of excusing a top executive.

The wording was so blunt that it incited a hostile reaction throughout Canada.

It came at a time when Canada's political parties were conducting their own great debate on defense and their relations with NATO and the United States.

And it probably will lead, not only to the fall of the present Canadian Government of Mr. Diefenbaker, but also to total failure of the plan to place nuclear weapons in Canadian bases.

Nuclear warheads are considered by competent authorities to be essential to the defense of North America. The Canadians have recognized the obligation in principle, but have dragged their feet on actually putting nuclear warheads on the interceptors and bombers and missiles which guard the DEW line early warning system and the Arctic approaches to this hemisphere.

As Gen. Curtis LeMay said the other day, there is a close and warm relationship between Canadian and United States military men and no lack of understanding on basic issues, so far as they are concerned.

The lack of understanding has arisen among the political leaders of the two nations. In this situation, a United States reminder of Canada's nuclear obligation certainly would have been proper even at the risk of straining otherwise friendly relations. Our country has a right to prod a reluctant ally.

But to hit a reluctant ally with a sledgehammer blow that created a fury of anti-Americanism and drove a wedge between the two countries was neither proper nor prudent.

Unfortunately, the affront to Canada is not an isolated event. It follows closely a calculated rudeness toward the British in the abrupt termination of the Skybolt missile. It brings to mind the lamentable lack of insight revealed by the administration by its dealings with General de Gaulle.

Perhaps, as the Wall Street Journal wryly suggested the other day, Mr. Kennedy's rough treatment of Roger Blough and United States Steel has become Washington's notion of diplomacy. In any event, it is not the way to win friends and influence allies.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania, as an independent nation, no longer exists. Incorporated into the Soviet Union in 1940, the territory has been subjected to brutal treatment. Thousands of its inhabitants have been exiled to Siberia. Massacres instigated by Communist authorities have annihilated entire villages, with the death toll for the entire nation running into the thousands. Much of the land has been allotted to Russians who have been settled on Lithuanian territory. The situation is grim and appears hopeless. But recent refugees bring word that the people continue to

strive for democratic privileges and, above all, for independence.

Lithuania has existed as a modern nation in this century. Czarist Russia had claimed the land as part of its empire since the 18th century, but the Lithuanian nationals established their own government and declared themselves free and sovereign from Russian rule on February 16, 1918. It is this act on that day which we commemorate as the 45th anniversary of the declaration of independence.

Lithuanian nationals scattered throughout the world keep alive the spirit of freedom for their homeland. They remember that those who remained under the oppressive Communist rule once enjoyed rights as freemen. The U.S. Government has refused to recognize the Communist takeover; it has continued to bolster the morale of the people through Voice of America broadcasts.

All of us, then, must do our part to keep alive the spirit of freedom. We call attention to their declaration of independence, their symbol of liberty, and extend to the Lithuanian people the hope that their nation may once more become a part of the world community, free and sovereign. Therefore, I salute the indomitable spirit displayed by these courageous people and their unyielding refusal to submit to the oppression of totalitarianism. Lithuania will always exist as a nation in the minds and hearts of people who recognize the dignity and inherent rights of man.

More Administration Doubletalk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the record of the Kennedy administration continues to be one of confusion, misinformation, and doubletalk. For whatever reason the administration cannot develop clear and forthright policies, the result is that we are courting disaster both at home and abroad. Our people are confused, our allies are beginning to mistrust us, and our enemies may well miscalculate our true intentions and push the button for world war III. The President should assume the full responsibility of his office which means making meaningful decisions and standing by them. Our almost total lack of an effective foreign policy is shown in the debacle of Cuba, our shameful loss in Laos, the continuing war in Vietnam where American boys are dying. On the domestic front the indecisiveness of the President is creating one of the worst strike records of recent years, business is being hurt by the proposals and counterproposals and proposals to overturn proposals in the tax field, and the administration continues to flounder from one crisis to another.

To point up the results of this kind of leadership I would like to include as a part of these remarks two editorials from the Wall Street Journal:

A FRIGHT FOR FRIENDS

To no one's great surprise, the end of America's international payments deficit is glimmering ever farther away. Balance was supposed to be restored late this year, but now Treasury Secretary Dillon says it may not come until 1964 or 1965.

At the rate the Government is going, that could be unduly optimistic. Last year the deficit was cut only \$500 million from \$2.5 billion in 1961. And Washington officials appear to be empty of useful ideas for getting out of this hole.

Mr. Dillon evidently plans to go on doing what he has been doing—make some effort to reduce military spending abroad, sell more U.S. weapons to allies, require more foreign-aid dollars to be spent in this country. None of this is enough; none of it gets to the root of the matter.

So far the Government has also been hoping that the Europeans would continue to cooperate and not do anything to aggravate the deficit. This hope looks considerably less impressive than it did a few weeks ago, with the Western alliance now in such a disheveled state. If De Gaulle wanted to give a further demonstration of his anti-Americanism, he could put quite a dent in what's left of our gold stock. Even if he has no such plans, this is an extremely poor time to be weakening confidence in the dollar, which is bound to be the consequence of letting the deficit and gold outflow go on almost unchecked.

Meantime, the only new suggestions being heard fall far short of the mark. George Mitchell, President Kennedy's sole appointee to the Federal Reserve Board, rightly expresses concern about the failure of the payments situation to improve enough to show the world our determination to correct it.

Mr. Mitchell's ideas of correctives are two new steps. One is a special tax incentive for U.S. exporters designed to lower the cost of American goods abroad; yet exports are the brightest part of the payments picture. The other is a special tax on movements of U.S. capital to Europe, aimed at trying to discourage European borrowing here; yet the return from U.S. investments exceeds the outflow.

This second proposal, Mr. Mitchell insists, would not be an outright curb on the exchange of U.S. dollars into European currencies. All the same, it seems clearly headed in the direction of exchange controls, something the Government has opposed until now.

Exchange controls would indeed be an admission of defeat. Moreover, such interference with capital movements would probably give everybody such a scare that it would worsen the whole payments condition.

That, though, is the kind of fix governments get into when they refuse to apply real remedies to their policies. A government, for example, will inflate the money supply for political or other purposes; then, when the inflation is getting out of hand it will slap on wage-price controls in a futile attempt to deal with symptoms. In the same simple-minded way, the time may come when exchange controls are presented as the cure of the payments sickness.

What urgently needs serious analysis and fundamental correction is the Government's entire monetary and fiscal policy at home and abroad. No matter how much the Government tried to blame others for the payments deficit, the fact is that if you remove Government from the calculation, there would be a payments surplus on commercial export and investment accounts. At home the Government is wedded to easy money and

enjoy preferred State and local tax treatment. And whereas companies are tightly regulated by State and Federal agencies, most co-ops can set their own rates. So the co-ops' competitive advantage is immense.

Now there's one fairly simple way to bring about competition on a more nearly equal basis. And that is to strip the REA co-ops of their protective mantle of subsidies and preferences and thus force them to really compete with private companies. In short, make the REA pay its way in the marketplace.

But as it is, the REA stands as an archetype of a Government agency that not only refuses to die when no longer needed but also uses every unfair means available to kill off its investor-financed competition.

Cuba File
The U.N. Should Not Bail Out Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, it is well known that the United States has urged and taken steps to evoke economic sanctions against the Castro regime in Cuba. It is also well known that the United States has been one of the most vigorous advocates of the United Nations and that the United States has been responsible for keeping the U.N. in a solvent financial condition.

It seems incredible that now the U.N. is going to grant money to the Castro government to build up their agriculture and in effect to improve their economic situation.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the penetrating editorial on this subject which appeared recently in the Nashville Banner:

INCREDIBLE JACKASSERY

There is incredible stupidity in the idea that the United States should sanction a U.N. money grant to build up agriculture in Castro's Cuba; and booby hatch arithmetic in attendant assurances that this shot in the arm to bolster that enemy's staggering economy wouldn't cost anything. That the program to that end originates with Paul G. Hoffman, one of our U.N. people, is a fact hardly calculated to redeem it from the tag of further policy jackassery.

The United States foots 40 percent of the bill for the whole U.N. special fund operation, headed by Mr. Hoffman. But if it cost this Nation not a penny, it still would transgress basic considerations of declared policy and good sense.

As long ago as October 1960, the United States clamped down an embargo on shipments to Cuba. To tighten that in the light of developing realities, Washington made motions last October of action to penalize all shipowners transporting Soviet-bloc supplies to that land; and another provision was announced to bar from U.S. ports any ship that on a continuous voyage had delivered nonmilitary Communist cargoes to Cuba.

We have joined other member countries of the Organization of American States in the declaration and policy-enforced by them, too—prohibiting business with Castro; on the premise of hemispheric solidarity against an avowed enemy. We have, in short, refused to be a party to the buildup either

militarily or economically of a Sovietized Communist foothold; and the climax, though of brief duration, was the naval blockade which recognized the fact, finally, that, yes, Castro's Cuba is an enemy.

By what fantastic reasoning is it now supposed that the people of the United States should pay for, or condone, free gifts to Castro to bail him out?

In the same category of U.N. mischief is UNESCO's newest publication, a gushing tribute to Soviet Russia's virtue, as this propagandic bilge describes it, as a brotherhood of free and equal peoples. For that blurb, to be put in world circulation, Uncle Sam also is tapped for a third of the cost.

It is expensive enough for the United States to finance its own policy operations—as addressed to keeping this Nation and the whole free world secure. It is preposterous to suggest further adventures in financing operations, in any particular, of the enemy.

Both pieces of this highlanded monkey business are under heavy fire in Congress. An accounting is due, by more than Mr. Hoffman, but certainly including him. It is time that somebody exercised the prerogative of advice and consent where policy is concerned.

Milton Smith, of Austin: A Texas Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, 32 years ago a young high school graduate came to Austin, Tex., from San Marcos, to engage in business. That was the same year I moved to Austin from El Paso.

Milton Smith's rise as a furniture manufacturer is one of the modern business success stories of Austin. He and his wife are civic and social leaders, as well as being engaged in business in Austin, my hometown. They support good government for the people.

Mr. Dave Shanks, editor of the business section of the daily Austin American, and author of the column, "Viewpoint," printed an account of Mr. Smith's business success under the title "Viewpoint—Milton Smith's Ventures: Now Mattresses Included" in the December 28, 1962 issue of the Austin American. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILTON SMITH'S VENTURES: NOW MATTRESSES INCLUDED

(By Dave Shanks)

Fresh from high school in San Antonio, Milton T. Smith came to Austin to start a furniture upholstery business.

That was 32 years ago, last October 18. Smith currently is the chief mogul in a furniture manufacturing complex big enough to rank him in the top half dozen Austin employers at his Economy Furniture, Inc., which has its own growthy corporate subsidiary, Dormae Products, Inc.

Dormae this week is showing off a new

plant, hailed as the "most modern mattress factory in the Southwest," a 65,000-square-foot manufacturing area and enough display and office space to add up to a 77,000-square-foot plant on McNeil Road, on Austin's North Side.

Significantly, Dormae signed on 2 years ago as a licensee of Serta Associates, Inc., one of the three "biggs" in the national bedding manufacturer's group and makers of the "Perfect Sleeper" mattresses for more than a quarter century.

Technically, Dormae is one of 42 member factories of the Serta group in the United States, Canada, the Philippine Islands and Brazil.

To help show off his new plant, Smith invited Serta's president, J. A. Ferguson of Chicago, and several hundred Dormae retailers, Austin civic officials, and business friends.

Dormae's beginning actually was the one-time Hurley mattress plant at 1101 East Sixth Street, which Smith acquired several years ago. For a time, Dormae was housed in the fire-razed oil mill in East Austin. Then came the new plant on McNeil Road.

The production line techniques will enable Serta Division to produce 800 pieces per day, utilizing 50 employees. The company supplies customers in over 200 counties of Texas, as well as in New Mexico, Oklahoma, Colorado, Louisiana, and Mexico, using its own fleet of trucks.

About Dormae's future, Serta President Ferguson says the new division probably will be one of Serta's major producers within less than 5 years.

The national bedding manufacturing industry is a big-scale marketing venture, headed by Simmons (a corporate manufacturer) and Serta and Sealy, both of whom are utilizing licensees to manufacture products sold under the Serta and Sealy trade names. Serta has 42 of the plants, Sealy about 35.

Serta was organized in the 1930's by half a dozen mattress makers, whose firms traditionally are small scale. Fifteen years ago, Ferguson came over from Sears to Serta, and he's been running the show for the last several years.

Some industry problems: A new standard-sized bed. The oldtime 39- by 75-inch bed size is a little small. Now, the length is about 80 to 82 inches, mostly because everybody is a little bit taller than they were years ago.

As for Smith, his business seems to keep on growing. Although he doesn't come right out with direct estimates of his employment, Smith's Economy Furniture reportedly hires about 250 persons to make Western Provincial, Smithtowne Maple, Bilt-Rite, and Royal Danish brand name furniture lines, that are marketed in permanent showrooms in Chicago, Dallas, Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Atlanta.

Smith is president of Economy. Guy C. Baird is sales manager. At Dormae, Bud Sweazea is general manager.

Cuba File
Facts on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald, of January 26, 1963. The following ed-

same genetic characteristics as the tree from which it came—its parent.

The scions are grafted by experts who attach the cambium layers together with the result that the stock of a tree growing at 1,000 foot elevation will produce seeds with the characteristics of a perfect tree growing at a 4,000 foot level or other desired heights. The height of the seed trees are kept low so the cones may be picked with ease. Through controlled pollination with man's help and nature's wonders an annual cone or seed crop is produced, a far cry indeed from our old hit-and-miss system.

Artificial pollinations are made by inclosing a section of a branch of the selected tree in a plastic bag. The bag is punctured with a long hypodermic needle and the cone is pollinated with the pollen from the selected tree to be crossed. These are called dam and sire trees.

The main obstacle to tree-improvement breeding is the long breeding cycle of forest trees. Forest trees in the fir and hemlock area develop from seed, to seedling, to maturity in 120 years or more.

Dr. Robert K. Campbell, assistant professor of forest genetics, College of Forestry and Institute of Forest Products, University of Washington, has conducted research in forest genetics for many years. He has been successful in the estimation of genetic gain in wood characteristics of mature trees resulting from seedling selections.

A tree farm is an area of privately owned forest land on which are grown continuous crops of merchantable forest products, under the best known forest management. These practices include intensive protection from fire, insects and disease, planned harvesting, and orderly removal of mature timber crops. To qualify as a certified tree farm, forest land must be operated according to rules which apply over all the United States. This program was started by the Government in 1941.

The American tree farm is similar in many ways to the tree farms (small woodland) in Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Norway, and Sweden. The main difference is that the Governments in these countries have laws which apply to both public and private land in regard to forest management. In the United States private forest landowners have banded together under an organization known as the National Tree Farms and have established rules pertaining to good forest practices as well as rules regarding fire, disease, and insect control.

The Western Pine Association sponsors tree farms in its region among all timberland owners, large or small. The 12-State western pine region has been in existence for 16 years and now has more than 1,400 tree farms under its jurisdiction totaling about 7 million acres. Western Oregon has 2,587,466 acres and western Washington has 8,504,150 acres in certified tree farms. The large tree farms, regardless of location, are open to the public, free of charge, for hunting, fishing and camping.

Overripe trees grow very slowly. Old-growth forests are easy prey to insects and disease. Proven harvesting methods (selective cutting) removes insect susceptibility in overripe trees and leaves the forest in a healthy growing condition. The danger of bark beetles can largely be reduced by marking for cutting the trees most susceptible to beetle attack.

This is part of the nationwide tree farm program which includes 45 States within whose borders are about 49 million acres of privately owned forest land.

The Weyerhaeuser Co. established the first certified tree farm in the United States. This company now has 12 certified tree farms—8 in the State of Washington and 4 in

Oregon. The public enjoys hunting and fishing privileges, and the camp and picnic grounds are maintained by the company.

The Crown-Zellerbach Co. has practiced forestry in Oregon and Washington in some degree for 73 years. In 1899 and subsequent years, old growth cottonwood was harvested along the Willamette River. Crews of men then set out thousands of young cottonwoods along the riverbanks and islands. This company now has five tree farms in Oregon and three in Washington.

The Simpson Co. obtains its raw material from 630,000 acres of timberlands. This company annually reforests about 5,000 acres of timberland through hand planting and aerial seeding. The Simpson Redwood Tree Farm includes cutover and second-growth lands in Del Norte and Humboldt Counties, Calif. It is also operated on a sustained yield basis. In both tree farm areas the company maintains, free for the public use, camp, picnic, and playgrounds.

The Shelton Cooperative sustained yield unit in Mason and Grays Harbor Counties in the State of Washington contains 240,000 acres of company-owned timberland combined with 111,400 acres of U.S. Forest Service land under 100-year management contract signed in 1946. The object of this unique contract, authorized by Public Law 273, the Sustained Yield Act of 1944, is to keep all lands within the Shelton unit in continuous tree production, to stabilize the economy of dependent communities served by the act, and to develop maximum conservation practices.

The U.S. Forest Service operates under the multiple-use program. This means that these public lands are managed so that portions that are best suited and adopted for lumbering, grazing, wildlife, watershed, and recreational purposes are used for such purposes and, through careful planning, two or more uses may be found that are capable of existing together. Water, timber production, and other public welfare requirements can be met on a sustained basis which will support the economy of the Nation.

The Forest Service maintains many good gravel roads in the national forests. Along these roads, forest camps and picnic grounds are established and maintained for the public's use. These camps contain outdoor fireplaces, picnic tables, sanitary facilities, and garbage disposal units. A supply of wood is usually provided, also. From many of these campsites good trails which the Government constructed and maintained lead to lakes or scenic spots.

A city dweller can transport his whole family within a few hours to these forest campgrounds. This is the reason that several million people visit our forest camps in our national forests annually. Most of these people assume that these forest camps are wilderness areas because they may be located 50 miles within the border of the national forest.

The wilderness area under the wilderness bill means primitive area. They contain no roads and no established campgrounds. They can be entered only on foot or with a packhorse. Only those who are physically strong and can carry a pack on their back to supply their needs—usually 90 pounds or more—can use this area.

What price wilderness? How many families would be able to hike many miles into these primitive areas? Can our country afford to take several million acres of workable forest land and make it into a primitive area which will become a breeding ground for pests and disease? What will it cost our tree farms, State school lands, and our National Forest Service to combat the increased menace of pests and disease?

REA: The Deadly Competitor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be an increasing interest in the Nation's press about the current activities of the Rural Electrification Administration and its tendencies to go beyond the role set out for the agency in the Rural Electrification Act. The Wall Street Journal is the latest to express its concern editorially on Tuesday, February 12, 1963. This editorial calls REA the Deadly Competitor.

There does, however, appear to be a typographical error in the third paragraph of the Wall Street Journal editorial where it refers to "16 percent" of its loans are going to build new generating and transmission lines. The year-end statement put out recently by REA pointed out that "for the second straight year, generation and transmission loans accounted for more than half—55.5 percent in 1962—of the total loans approved."

Notwithstanding this typographical error, I think the editorial is worthwhile reading for every Member of this Chamber as an indication of this growing problem. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert this statement of editorial opinion of the Wall Street Journal in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE DEADLY COMPETITOR

The act of 1936 setting up the Rural Electrification Administration authorized the agency to make loans for furnishing electricity to "persons in rural areas." How is it, then, that in the last few years five out of six new REA co-op customers haven't been truly rural at all, but commercial, industrial and nonrural residential?

For one thing, REA activities reflect the changing character of the Nation; farms are fewer, suburbs have sprawled out from the cities into once-rural lands. And REA Administrator Norman Clapp contends that a territory developed by a co-op "in good faith" when it was rural still is co-op territory even though today it may be a vast suburban or industrial complex.

For another, as Hubert Kay notes in an article in the February Fortune magazine, the REA's co-ops have become increasingly aggressive in going after commercial-industrial business. So much so that whereas it once used only 2.5 percent of its loans to build new generating plants and transmission lines it now uses over 16 percent. The REA system's rapid growth as a power-producer has further alarmed already skittish investor-owned power companies which see in REA an ever-expanding power grid with which they cannot forever compete.

For the private utilities pay from 4 to 5 percent for money they need to borrow; the co-ops have the use of Federal funds at 2 percent which the Government borrows at 4 percent. Utilities pay out about 24 cents in taxes of each dollar received, including 13 cents in Federal income tax; co-ops pay no direct Federal taxes at all and, as co-ops,

itorial calls for a complete factual report on the Cuban mess created by the Kennedy administration.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Jan 26, 1963]

FACTS ON CUBA

The Armed Forces of the United States are commanded by generals and admirals who learned in World War II and in Korea the importance of air cover in an attempted invasion.

Yet we Americans are now told on the highest authority that no air support by U.S. Forces was ever contemplated in the Cuban invasion of 1961. And we are told by the President's brother that the Joint Chiefs of Staff approved the plan.

This is exactly the opposite of the impression the American people have been permitted to entertain these past 21 months. It is contrary to what Cuban rebel leaders say was their understanding at the time.

The story that had been generally accepted until now is that plans had been made to provide U.S. air cover, but that the President called them off.

Members of Congress are distressed by this long-delayed clarification by the Kennedy administration, and we surmise that the Congressmen have a lot of company among their constituents.

It is not enough that the President takes the blame for the failure of the landing. The American people should be told precisely what it is for which he is taking the blame.

Who made the planning errors? Who approved them? Were the plans changed, and, if so, at what stage of the invasion were they changed?

The questions press for answers because this country now faces what appears to be another ominous turn of events in Cuba.

Senator KEATING, Republican, of New York, who was the unheeded herald of the Soviet buildup in Cuba last summer and fall, says new, intensive military activity is underway there. It involves many weapons, including fighter planes that can carry nuclear warheads, and torpedo boats that can do the same.

The New York Times Service tells of busy, secret activity of Soviet troops and encampments in Cuba and "highly sophisticated ground and air defenses" now being installed.

By all the signs, something is cooking in Cuba. Yet the President says in effect that all is well. He says only one Russian ship has landed in Havana since October. He says there is no evidence that offensive arms were in its cargo. He says our planes are keeping sharp surveillance. And so on, in reassuring phrases.

But if it takes almost 2 years to get the administration's version of some of the facts about one Cuban crisis, can the American people be sure they are getting all the undadorned facts about Cuba now?

We believe that is a fair question. We believe Members of Congress are fully justified in pressing for the full story of what went on in Cuba in 1961, in 1962 and what is going on in January 1963.

A Realistic View of the Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague and good friend, Con-

gressman ROBERT H. MICHEL, of Illinois, has taken what I consider to be a realistic, though blunt, view of the administration's farm program. I concur with him in that view when he calls the farm program "a masterpiece of Keynesian double talk." For New England the farm program simply means more regulation, higher taxes to pay for it, higher costs of feed for our dairy and poultry producers and higher prices for every consumer.

The Chicago Tribune pushes this analogy of double talk a bit further in an editorial complimenting Congressman MICHEL on his stand. That editorial makes some interesting points which I know will be of concern to those taking an overall view of this year's proposals.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of February 13, 1963:

DEFENDING THE INDEFENSIBLE

Representative MICHEL, Republican, of Illinois, a member of the House Appropriations Committee's agriculture subcommittee, describes President Kennedy's latest pitch for new farm legislation as "phony" and a "masterpiece of Keynesian double talk." In a speech to an Illinois State Chamber of Commerce meeting, Representative MICHEL, observed that although the administration claims credit for substantially boosting farm income, reducing surpluses, and cutting farm program costs to taxpayers, the President maintains that feed grains, dairy products, and cotton are in trouble and must be rescued by more subsidies.

Well, if this appears inconsistent and contradictory, consider what the President is up against. He has taken it upon himself to defend a farm program under which the government pays farmers for not growing crops, while at the same time raising subsidies and paying for conservation practices that encourage them to grow crops.

It buys crops to keep prices high, then sells them to depress prices. It tries to promote exports to reduce the surpluses, then sets prices too high to sell them. It reclaims new land for agricultural production under one program and retires land under another.

The President, in other words, is attempting to defend a program that is costly unworkable, and indefensible.

Planned Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Des Moines Register of February 7. This article, a reprint from the Wall Street Journal, poses some questions about the so-called "planned deficit" theory of Government financing.

The editorial follows:

WALL STREET JOURNAL WRITER DEBUNKS PLANNED DEFICITS

In arguing for its tax program the Kennedy administration seems to be trying to

separate the idea of tax cuts from the thought of the deficits which would accompany them.

It says present taxes are burdensome and should be reduced, which is probably true, but it doesn't any longer claim, as it once did, that deficits themselves would stimulate business.

Nevertheless, the two ideas can't very well be separated, especially when the Government continues to insist that its spending should not be cut. Among some economists, the idea that governmental deficits are stimulants for business is still very much alive.

IT REMAINS UNPROVEN

Yet this claim remains unproven. Apparently it stems from the experiences of great wars, when business operates at capacity, accompanied by large deficits.

However, at such times the Government invades the commercial markets with overwhelmingly enormous demands for goods and services in competition with normal needs—all for the waste of war and regardless of costs.

To see how deficits work in peacetime it is more useful to analyze the results during substantial periods of years, both here and in other countries.

THE TWO PERIODS

Two such periods were the years 1932 to 1940 inclusive, and 1949 to 1962, inclusive. In addition, figures are easily available for some European countries for the 1950's.

There were Federal Government deficits in every one of the 9 years 1932-40. In relation to the then economic size of the Nation, they were quite large, ranging from just under \$2 billion to more than \$4 billion, figures which even today are regarded as substantial.

In relation to gross national production (GNP) the deficits ranged from 1.3 percent to 5.5 percent, and the average was just slightly less than 4 percent. In spite of these substantial deficits, unemployment in those years ranged from 14.3 percent of the labor force to 24.9 percent, and averaged about 19 percent.

FOUR SURPLUSES, 10 DEFICITS

In the 14 years 1949-62 there were 4 surpluses and 10 deficits. The net total of the deficits and surpluses, matched up against the total of the gross national production figures for all 14 years, shows an average deficit of 0.7 percent of GNP.

In spite of this much smaller relative deficit than in the 1930's the rate of unemployment was far less and remains far less. The range of unemployment was from 2.9 percent of the labor force in the best year to 6.8 percent in the poorest, and the average was 5 percent.

The comparison is a fair one because in the 1930's the deficits, except for a couple of the early ones, were purposeful. The late President Roosevelt publicly proclaimed that it is today's deficit which generates tomorrow's surplus. He meant that deficits would so stimulate business that pretty soon tax collections would rise enough to cover Government spending. It didn't happen that way.

EUROPEAN EXPERIENCE

The recent experience of several European nations is also useful. One reason is that their economic growth in recent years has been more rapid than ours. The other is that some of the current advice to us, that we should run big deficits in order to copy their growth rates, comes from over there.

The following comparisons start with the year 1953 because since then the countries cited have benefited only very slightly from foreign aid, mainly in the earlier years of the period. The period covered ends with 1961 because complete figures aren't available for 1962.

FIGURED BY DEBT

Also governmental deficits are not measured in this case by matching revenues against expenditures, but by how much the outstanding debts rose. This avoids the problem of making sure the various nations use the same accounting methods.

Starting with the United States for a basis of comparison, the increase in debt from 1953 through 1961 amounted to only 0.4 percent of gross national production. In that time the index of industrial production—used as a measure of growth in activity because it isn't affected by price changes—rose from a 1958-base index of 97 to an index of 117, or slightly more than 20 percent.

In the case of France, the increase in debt for the period is 1.7 percent of gross national output; and the gain in industrial production is from 86 to 122, or 85 percent. The deficits have been relatively larger than ours, and the industrial growth much faster, which seems to support the backers of deficits.

IN ITALY, GERMANY

However, in Italy we find the debt rising only 1.3 percent of gross national product and industrial production a full 100 percent, from 70 to 140. The debt expansion is relatively smaller than France's, yet the production gain is bigger.

And when we come to Germany, the debt increase is 0.1 percent of gross national product, an amount clearly of no consequence, while the production gain is 92 percent, a little better than France's and almost as good as Italy's.

Looking at some of the figures for individual years, it is amusing to note how the line of argument can be twisted in two different ways to arrive at precisely opposing conclusions. The widest annual gain in the French production index for the whole period took place from 1959 to 1960. That was also the year in which the French Government's debt showed its smallest increase for the whole period.

HOW IT CAN BE ARGUED

On the basis of these figures it would be possible to argue, in the style of the late President Roosevelt, that it was the deficits of the preceding years which had generated the near-surplus of 1960. But it would also be possible to argue the opposite—that the sounder Government finances of 1960 were what stimulated business.

The real truth, within limits, is probably that business activity has more to do with controlling Government finances than the other way around. That is, it's difficult to balance the budget in depressions, and it ought to be easy when business is good.

Beyond that, the various sets of figures cited above suggest that economic theories regarding what can be accomplished by by planned deficits approach the nonsensical.

Cuba File
Missile Count in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. MCLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. MCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Chicago Tribune. It points out some pertinent questions should be asked about the flights over Cuba and

their effectiveness in determining whether or not missiles are there.

The editorial follows:

MISSILE COUNT IN CUBA

Onsite inspection in Cuba to verify dismantling of the Soviet missile bases and withdrawal of the missiles was the big issue last October at the height of the Cuban war crisis. President Kennedy at that time insisted on such inspection by the United Nations, in order to be certain that the Russians, who had lied about everything else, actually pulled out their missiles.

Now, as Mr. Kennedy conceded at his recent press conference, onsite inspection is "a dead letter." "There has been none," said the President "and I don't expect to get any." What the United States must rely on as a substitute, he added, is aerial photography. The administration bases its belief that all of the offensive Russian weapons systems have been withdrawn on photographic evidence.

The only way to remove all doubt, John McCone of the Central Intelligence Agency told the Senate, is by inspection of Cuba's network of underground caverns and hidden storage areas. But Fidel Castro, as Mr. Kennedy said, is not about to grant the United States such permission.

Last October 27, in an exchange of letters with Premier Khrushchev, Mr. Kennedy gave the impression that the Russian had agreed to U.N. inspection of his missile withdrawal. "As I read your letter," Mr. Kennedy wrote Khrushchev, "the Soviets had agreed to U.N. supervision of the missile pullout."

The President in his communication chose, however, to ignore other aspects of the Khrushchev letter. Khrushchev hedged his U.N. on-site inspection pledge by calling for Castro's approval. He also proposed withdrawal of American missiles from Turkey, a condition that the President ignored, although he has since ordered their removal.

On-site inspection has gradually dribbled into the diplomatic background and finally dropped out of sight, forgotten by all except critics of Mr. Kennedy's actions.

As excellent as is aerial photography, it failed to uncover the arrival in Cuba of Khrushchev's extensive missile system. The missiles were landed secretly and hidden, then made a sudden appearance on the October 14 photographs of the Soviet concrete launching pads.

Forty-two medium- and intermediate-range ballistic missiles and 42 IL-28 nuclear bombers were counted by the photographers leaving Cuba aboard Soviet ships. But only 30 of the missiles had been counted on our above-ground aerial photographs before the Russian pullout. Obviously the "hard" intelligence cameras of our photoreconnaissance planes can't peer inside Castro's caves and underground storage depots. The time for getting onsite inspection in Cuba was when Mr. Kennedy had his guns pointed down Khrushchev's throat.

Farmers Manage Half of Private Business in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently noted some very interesting statistics relative to the American farmer and would

like to share them with my colleagues. These statistics appeared in the February 15, 1963, edition of The Washington World.

The article follows:

FARMERS MANAGE HALF OF PRIVATE BUSINESS IN THE UNITED STATES

Farmers manage half of all the private business in the United States according to a recent estimate by a noted food economist.

Dr. Karl Brandt, of Stanford University, says that farmers' assets nearly equal the value of all stocks listed on the New York Stock Exchange.

Gross income for farmers in 1961 was \$49 billion—nearly as much as the whole U.S. defense budget.

Petroleum Today magazine adds that 4 of every 10 jobs in American private enterprise are, in some way, related to agriculture.

Every farmer keeps 2.5 men busy in town, 1 to supply him and 1½ to process, distribute, and sell his products.

Farmers use four times as much mechanical horsepower as all U.S. factories put together.

Farmers use more petroleum products than any other industry and utilize more electricity than Chicago, Kansas City, Detroit, Houston, and half a dozen other major cities combined.

Address of Hon. Everett MacIntyre,
Commissioner of the Federal Trade
Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Everett MacIntyre, former General Counsel of the House Small Business Committee, and now a distinguished Commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission, recently addressed a meeting of the New York Bar Association on "Fair Advertising Landmarks."

Commissioner MacIntyre sets out the meaning of important cases before the Federal Trade Commission on the 25th anniversary of the Wheeler-Lea Act concerned with unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce.

Mr. Speaker, Under unanimous consent, I include Commissioner MacIntyre's remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

STATEMENT ON FAIR ADVERTISING LANDMARKS
(By Everett MacIntyre)

INTRODUCTION

It is fitting that your meeting today celebrates the 25th anniversary of the enactment of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and in that connection commemorates the silver anniversary of the Wheeler-Lea amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act. Indeed, it is a pleasure to participate with you here today in the celebration of the silver anniversary of the Wheeler-Lea Act, the act of March 21, 1938, which so greatly strengthened the authority of the Federal Trade Commission to protect businessmen and the public from false advertising and other deceptive and unfair acts and practices. Everyone recognizes the Wheeler-Lea Act as one of the great landmarks for fair advertising.

The first three points of the immortal preamble to the Legion's constitution, written by our founding fathers, and familiar to every Legionnaire, express our concern in these words:

"For God and country, we associate ourselves together for the following purposes:

"To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order; to foster and perpetuate a 100 percent Americanism." These are but the first 3 points of a 10-point code of honor and program of action which the American Legion carries out in the fervent hope and firm belief that by so doing we help perpetuate the ideals and principles upon which America was built and through which she has grown and prospered.

Important to this cause, we believe, is our longstanding position of support and encouragement to the House Un-American Activities Committee. The American Legion has long held that the work of this committee is vital to the security of America, for it provides one of our most authoritative sources of information regarding the activity and the identity of those groups and individuals who would destroy us from within. In the face of well organized and vocal opposition to the continuation of the committee which is working on the 88th Congress, now in session, the American Legion stands firm in its continued support of the committee.

There are those who contend that the work of the committee violates the constitutional rights of certain groups and individuals. In the opinion of the Legion, those who hold this view confuse liberty with license, for we believe the Constitution and the law of the land are instruments for the protection of the innocent, and were never intended to provide a refuge for the guilty.

Yet, we have seen it happen time and again, in courtrooms across the land and before congressional committees, where those who would destroy the Constitution and defy the law, hide behind the protective features of the very documents which they would render useless if but granted the license they seek.

Through our many positive programs of Americanism, the American Legion devotes a substantial part of its total effort to instilling a love of country and a respect for and understanding of the importance of an orderly system of government, and the need for adherence to the laws of God as well as the laws of man.

You Legionnaires know our Americanism program well, for many of you have devoted much personal time and effort to one or more of these projects to insure their success. For the benefit of non-Legionnaires may I cite a few examples of the scope of our program.

During the 1962 American Legion baseball season, some 13,891 teams were certified for Legion championship competition, providing wholesome recreational opportunity for a quarter of a million boys, who, while learning the game of baseball under the direction of American Legionnaires, also learned something about the game of life.

Nearly 27,000 boys participated last year in American Legion Boys State and Boys Nation. These youngsters, who set up and operate their own state and national governments, learn much about our form of government by actually performing the functions of government under our established system.

More than 355,000 high school youngsters competed in our 1962 national oratorical contest, and to be eligible for competition each participant had to be prepared to speak on some phase of the Constitution of the United States. The year 1962 marked the silver anniversary of the contest in which well over 5 million youngsters have

competed over the span of a quarter of a century.

Last year, American Legion posts presented more than 27,000 school medal awards, in recognition of outstanding scholarship combined with outstanding citizenship.

During 1961, the latest year for which complete figures are available, American Legion posts sponsored 4,199 Boy Scout units, making the Legion the largest single sponsor of the Boy Scout movement outside the combined churches of America.

We distributed nearly 100,000 copies of "Need a Lift?", our guide to scholarship opportunities which is designed to help deserving young people further their education. Through our child welfare programs we seek to preserve the sanctity of the home, and to help build strong bodies to house strong minds.

Yes, my friends, we have accomplished a great deal through the years, but we cannot relax our efforts for a great deal remains to be done. If we should rest on our oars at this critical hour in the Nation's history, we would soon find ourselves swept to destruction by the powerful tides of corruption and subversion which we now seek to combat.

To safeguard this America of ours for today and for tomorrow is going to require the continued best efforts of the Nation's law-enforcement officers, of the American Legion, and of all concerned Americans. The battle will not be an easy one, but the victory will be worth the effort, and I am confident that the ultimate victory will be ours.

Tribute to Former Senator Knowland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Knowland Named Citizen of Year," published in the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune of recent date, being a tribute to former Senator William F. Knowland, of California.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KNOWLAND NAMED CITIZEN OF YEAR

William F. Knowland, editor and assistant publisher of the Tribune, has been named Oakland's "Outstanding Citizen of 1962" for his longstanding personal efforts in the field of public service.

The announcement was made today by Judge Homer W. Buckley, chairman of the selection committee of the Oakland Inter-Services Club Council and the Oakland Chamber of Commerce, cosponsors of the project.

The award will be presented at a civic banquet Wednesday evening, February 20, at Jack London Hall. The event will serve as a testimonial to Knowland's 13 years of service in the U.S. Senate.

The honor was established by the Inter-Services Club Council in 1948 to give public recognition to citizens who give freely of their time, talents, and funds to civic work and to inspire others to enter this field of service.

In selecting Knowland for the 1962 award, the committee noted that he had a long record of devoted personal service in civic

and welfare projects. His nomination, submitted by several groups, included the following citations of his beyond-the-call-of-duty public services in 1962:

"As editor, assistant publisher, and general manager of the Oakland Tribune, he gave leadership and promotion which carried a large number of civic and humanitarian projects to success, including the rapid transit issue, and advanced others including the Oakland-Alameda County Coliseum, Inc., multipurpose facility, the Oakland Museums complex, the United Crusade and the Boy Scouts campaign for new camp facilities. Without this publicity and encouragement, many of these all-important projects would have failed.

"To the solving of Oakland's civic and welfare problems he gave freely of the vast knowledge and experience he attained in a political career that was climaxed by his selection as the majority leader of the world's most powerful body, the U.S. Senate.

"His civic roles in 1962 included: director and member of the executive committee of the Oakland Chamber of Commerce; vice president of Oakland-Alameda County Coliseum, Inc.; chairman of the Regional Committee for Better Service at Oakland International Airport; chairman of the Oakland Central Business District Committee; foreman of the Alameda County Grand Jury; member of the board of directors of California State Chamber of Commerce; member board of governors, Bay Area Council; and key roles in a host of other committees and organizations that worked for a bigger and better Oakland and for the welfare of the citizenry."

Among the past recipients of this award are Willie Osburn, Thad McCarty, Raymond H. Miller, Mrs. Carl E. Whitehouse, Jack Fitzpatrick, the late Henry Kaiser, Jr., Nat Levy, Charles P. Howard, and William Albertoni.

Cuba File
Where Is Our Victory Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of January 28, 1963. This editorial points out that the "victory" purportedly scored in Cuba has now been wiped out by remounting of a Soviet armed camp atmosphere in Castroland.

The article is as follows:

WHERE IS OUR VICTORY NOW?

President Kennedy has denied that a new Soviet military buildup is under way in Cuba. He thus contradicts Senators KEATING and LAUSCHE, a number of columnists and Cuban exile leaders.

Yet it was much the same sources that warned a deaf America for weeks and months that Russian rockets were pouring into Cuba. Kennedy and his administration sloughed off the reports then as they are doing now. Is the President wrong again?

After hearing Secretary of State Rusk on Friday at a closed meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator ARKEN of Vermont said he believed, "Russia has built an enormously strong military and political base in Cuba, much stronger than it was 6 months ago."

February 18

Senator SYMINGTON also expressed serious concern over the large Soviet air complex in Cuba.

The size and nature of the reported buildup indicate that a successful sneak attack from Cuba could incinerate the Southeastern United States.

Complete congressional investigation should be imperative.

Senator KEATING argues that "official Government sources" confirm his reports. Castro is now "10 times better equipped" militarily than he was last spring, the New York Republican charges.

Russia is building highly sophisticated ground and air defenses, Soviet encampments are being relocated and strengthened, and Soviet experts are directing Cubans in the construction of underground depots, hangars, and runways, according to the New York Times news service. The dispatch also stated Soviet troops are working on other sites closed to Cuban personnel.

Underground hangars are for what, Mr. Kennedy? The answer is apparent.

There are at least 100 MIG fighters in Cuba. They can be fitted with atomic bombs.

The buildup also involves tanks, guns, amphibious vehicles, planes and torpedo boats. When do these become offensive, Mr. Kennedy? When the boats and planes rake a Latin American coast and the amphibians land troops on some Latin shore? Ask any marine if an amphibian is a defensive vehicle?

Cuba is again building up frightening armament with Castro holding an American pledge not to invade. Where, Mr. President, is our victory now?

Partisan Attacks on Foreign Policy—Bipartisan Policy Should Be Maintained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, recently there have been several vicious attacks upon President Kennedy and his foreign policy. These attacks made during recent political speeches obviously have been for partisan rather than for constructive purposes.

The Nashville Tennessean in a recent edition carried an article by Mr. James Reston of the New York Times News Service, pointing out that the criticism of President Kennedy's foreign policy is getting somewhat out of hand. Reston goes on to show that the unity that has existed behind the President previously has now somewhat disintegrated, not because the President has failed, but because he has been successful in various areas of our Nation's policy of foreign affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this article be reprinted in the Appendix of the Record.

The article follows:

FOREIGN POLICY CRITICS GETTING OUT OF HAND

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—The criticism of President Kennedy's foreign policy is now getting a little out of hand.

No doubt mistakes of tactics and even of taste have been made recently over the handling of Cuba, Canada, Britain, and France, but in the broadest sense, the President is in trouble now, not because his major foreign policies have failed but because they are succeeding.

France and Canada are not refusing to accept U.S. nuclear weapons because they feel that Kennedy has weakened the West, but precisely because they think the West is relatively so strong that they can now follow a more independent policy and risk division within the alliance.

The unity that existed behind the President when he risked war to get the Soviet missiles out of Cuba has vanished, not because he failed to get the missiles and bombers out, but precisely because he got them out and is now safe to turn around and argue about the secondary issue of the Soviet troops.

Britain did not refuse to accept De Gaulle's terms for entrance into the Common Market because of any weakness in Washington, but precisely because it preferred to go along with the United States and the Atlantic Community rather than with De Gaulle and an inward-looking Europe.

The paradox of the present situation is that everything in the cold war remains about the same as it was at the beginning of the year, yet everything seems different.

De Gaulle was refusing to cooperate with Washington and London on the defense and organization of Europe long before his famous press conference. He has since emphasized and formalized his position, but the opposition was there before.

Much the same can be said about Canada. Prime Minister Diefenbaker was refusing to accept the United States nuclear warheads long before the State Department stumbled clumsily into an internal Canadian squabble; the only new thing is that he has now made an election issue out of Washington's awkward efforts to clarify the facts.

This does not mean that formalizing the differences doesn't change anything. As Dean Acheson says, a married couple may separate in private, but it makes a difference if they start fighting in public and head for Reno.

The question now is whether the Kennedy administration could have done anything to avoid the split with De Gaulle, the fight with Canada, and the present situation in Cuba. Much can be said on both sides of all three questions, and the President is certainly not blameless.

He first stumbled into Cuba and then misjudged Moscow's offensive policy there. It may be that he should now be considering a blockade of that island to get the Soviet troops out; that is a matter of opinion. But the critics are going beyond or behind all this to imply what they have not proved; namely, that the President made a deal with Khrushchev to scrap the missile bases in Turkey and Italy; and beyond this, that the Soviets now have offensive missiles hidden in Cuba.

These last are charges of stupidity, bad faith, or worse, and should either be proved or withdrawn. There is plenty of material on the Cuban issue for hard, fair criticism, and Kennedy's handling of the offensive buildup in Cuba justifies plenty of skepticism, but implications of secret deals and concealed weapons confuse and weaken the country unless they are supported with evidence.

The psychology of the opposition to President Kennedy here is clear enough. First, it is the duty of the opposition to oppose. Also, Kennedy clobbered the Republicans in the last presidential campaign with the charge that they had debased the Nation's "prestige" overseas.

In this situation, the Republicans are naturally eager to pounce on him when he roughs up our Canadian neighbors or mis-

judges De Gaulle's intentions, and all this is fair enough.

But the thing has to be kept in perspective. For the conflict with a nation's enemies is more important than the quarrels with its allies, and on balance, the conflict with the Communists is not going too badly.

None of the apocalyptic horrors of the pessimists about Berlin, the Congo, or Vietnam has transpired. None of Moscow's "inevitable victories" in Africa, southeast Asia, or the Middle East has taken place. If De Gaulle is awkward for Kennedy, Mao Tse-tung is no obedient servant of Khrushchev.

Meanwhile, fear in the Western Alliance has abated, and without fear a whole new set of problems has arisen, requiring new policies and new criticism. Yet the whole alliance is not falling apart and 17,000 Russians are not about to conquer the Western Hemisphere.

"We have to learn to live with these problems in Cuba and elsewhere," the President has said. And this of course, is precisely the difficulty. For the American people don't want to learn to live with their problems or with the Russians, especially in Cuba. They want them to go away, all of them, and immediately, if not sooner.

Franklin D. Roosevelt
Cuba a Risky Political Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in this morning's issue of the Washington Post appeared an article by Marquis Childs entitled, "Cuba Is Risky Political Issue."

In my judgment, the well written column points out the difficulties attendant to the fact that Cuba today is under the control of the Communists. The problem does not lend itself to easy and simple solutions. The column is very thought-provoking. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the Record for the benefit of Members of Congress who might not have read it previously.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 18, 1963]

CUBA IS RISKY POLITICAL ISSUE

(By Marquis Childs)

American policy makers are currently reviewing every front in the cold war as the premises of only yesterday no longer seem valid. But, above all, in Cuba the review has an urgency that reflects the tangle of politics and power, both national and international, threatening to bring another confrontation at least as grave as that of last October.

The way out is far from clear. President Kennedy in his private correspondence with Chairman Khrushchev has put great emphasis on the danger of allowing up to 17,000 Soviet troops to continue to build up a bastion of communism 90 miles from America's shores.

It is not ruled out that most of these troops will be withdrawn and their departure verified. This is, however, a hope fading fast as time runs out.

On March 18 the President goes to Costa Rica to meet with the six Central American Presidents. The presence in Washington of Venezuela's President Romulo Betancourt points up the peril of subversion exported from the Cuban bastion. It is this peril that underscores the weakness in the administration position.

Put as simply as possible, the facts seem to be: Cuba is not a military threat to the United States and to talk as though it were is a disservice to national unity. But it is a threat to the hemisphere, and with the continuing deterioration in many areas in Latin America this endangers the whole structure that the Alliance for Progress is designed to underwrite.

Therefore, serious consideration is being given to a new resolution to be brought before the Council of the Organization of American States. This would go a step beyond the unanimous OAS declaration of last October in that it would find the presence of Soviet troops to be a danger to the entire hemisphere.

The way would be open for a new blockade of Cuba. The likelihood, according to American officials directly concerned, would be for approval by at least two-thirds of the member states. Five of the twenty-one Latin-American countries—Mexico, Chile, Brazil, Uruguay, and Bolivia—still have diplomatic relations with the Castro regime. They might not go along.

But since this would be a direct confrontation between the two giants, with only an indirect relationship to the hemisphere, they might also support the resolution. They would be saying in effect, "let's you and him fight."

That complication is the presence in this country of close to 200,000 Cubans who have chosen exile rather than endure the tyranny of the Castro regime. They fled leaving all their possessions behind them and often in great danger. But as almost invariably happens they have broken up into bitterly antagonistic factions and their factionalism is reflected in the politics of Cuba in this country.

The exiles range from those who, in effect, demand that the United States take direct military action to restore all property to its previous owners—to those who were with Castro in his sweeping reforms up to the point when the Communists took command. It is not hard for exile spokesmen to get to Members of Congress. They have information out of Cuba which they believe, although from all indications the Russians are guarding their own military enclaves and the only Cubans admitted are laborers carefully screened.

There is an unhappy analogy here with what happened after China fell to communism in 1949-50. Chinese exiles, some of whom had benefited hugely from the graft that accompanied large-scale aid to Chiang Kai-shek, exerted a great influence on American policy. Among a people unflinchingly sympathetic to the plight of homeless exiles such pressures work on public opinion and one result is that our own immediate national interest is lost sight of.

This is not to say that the Republicans, and Democrats, attacking the administration on Cuba are misguided or insincere. Senator KENNETH KEATING, the principal critic, was proved right after the Cuban missile crisis broke into the open with the President's speech of October 22.

But another election is always just around the corner and in an era in which domestic issues seem to have been eroded away it is tempting to find a weak spot where emotions can be easily played upon. In the 1960 Kennedy campaign the "missile gap" was an emotional ploy. As we have subsequently learned, the "missile gap" was a myth.

The more Cuba becomes embedded in domestic politics the more difficult it will be

to put an end to a situation of the utmost seriousness. With "who lost Cuba?" as a major issue next year, the emotions of the past will obscure the grim realities and necessities of the present.

Milestone in Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today there is being celebrated at the University of Chicago another milestone in the atomic age. The country will never forget the service of that noble group of scientists who, at the University of Chicago, started the development of the mighty force of atomic energy that would develop the future of mankind.

Arthur J. Snider is the able and knowledgeable science writer of the Chicago Daily News. He tells so well the story of today's anniversary observance that I am extending my remarks to include his article, in a recent edition of the Chicago Daily News, as follows:

U. OF C. TO MARK ANOTHER MILESTONE OF ATOMIC AGE—PLAN TO OBSERVE FIRST WEIGHING OF PLUTONIUM

(By Arthur J. Snider)

That Chicago was the birthplace of the first atomic chain reaction is known the world over, but few are aware of another atomic distinction—the purification and weighing of the first manmade element, plutonium.

The production, an amount no larger than a speck of dust, was found to weigh one ten-millionth of an ounce. It would have taken 900,000 such specks to equal the weight of a dime.

From that submicroscopic beginning, the U.S. Government went on to build huge secret plants to process plutonium as the atomic bomb fuel.

This biggest scale-up in history gambled that the chain reaction experiment, to take place some 3 months later, would be successful.

Next Monday, a belated 20th anniversary observance of the first weighing of plutonium will be held on the University of Chicago campus.

Among those to take part in the daylong symposium are the two Nobel prize-winning codiscoverers of plutonium, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, now Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Dr. Edwin M. McMillan, director of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley.

Plutonium was discovered at Berkeley in 1941 by Seaborg and his associates. It could not be seen. It was identifiable only by its radioactive characteristics.

Samples of uranium oxide, from which the plutonium was obtained by bombardment in an atom-smashing cyclotron, were sent to the University of Chicago where the wartime Metallurgical Laboratory had been established.

In room 405 of George Herbert Jones Laboratory, 5747 South Ellis, scientists on August 18, 1942, saw through a microscope the first pure compound of plutonium. It was weighed on September 10.

As part of the observance Monday, a plaque will be hung on the door of room 405 to note the event.

Plutonium has made possible the growth of the atomic energy program. Without it, scarce fissionable material would be limited largely to weapons.

The only other significant source of fissionable material is uranium 235, which constitutes less than 1 percent of natural uranium. But much of the remaining 99 percent can be converted into plutonium in a so-called breeder reactor.

The promise of breeder reactors is to increase greatly the available fuel supply, making nuclear electric power more economic.

Last November 28, Argonne National Laboratory achieved the first self-sustaining chain reaction using plutonium as a fuel in power producing.

The 28.7 kilograms of plutonium fuel was more than 10 billion times the amount weighed at the University of Chicago two decades ago.

Plutonium was used in space flight as the "atomic battery" to generate electricity aboard the navigational satellite, Transit IV-A. Plutonium reactors are being looked to as the power source for distant space flights.

"Little Giant" in House—Carl Bert Albert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, we in Tennessee are very proud of our distinguished majority leader, CARL BERT ALBERT.

There appeared on Thursday, February 14, in the Chattanooga Times, an outstanding newspaper not only of Tennessee but of the Nation as well, a wonderful article relative to our leader. It was so well written that I felt I should bring it to the attention of the Congress.

The article follows:

"LITTLE GIANT" IN HOUSE—CARL BERT ALBERT

WASHINGTON.—CARL BERT ALBERT, the Democratic majority leader of the House of Representatives, is a quiet, scholarly legislator who seldom raises his voice in vigorous debate. But when he does sound off he packs a load of ammunition that commands the respect of all his colleagues regardless of party affiliation. For he is a Phi Beta Kappa honors winner, a Rhodes scholar with two advanced degrees, a self-taught linguist, a masterly grassroots politician, a tournament bridge player, a serious student of history and a product of a small cotton farm and coal mining background.

Moreover, it is a common saying in the Congress that "nobody's mad at Carl"—a tribute from his fellow Representatives to the fact that he has few if any enemies. And the politicians among them recognize that it's hard to beat a candidate with that kind of record.

He comes from the Little Dixie section of Oklahoma—the southeastern corner of the State, just north of Texas and west of Arkansas. There he is billed as "the little giant from Little Dixie," a reference to the fact that while he is only 5 feet, 4 inches tall, he has a big voice on the hustings and delivers his speeches with a fiery and flamboyant style.

ALBERT was born on May 10, 1908, one of five children of Ernest Homer Albert, a small cotton farmer and coal miner. He was born at McAlester but grew up on the cotton farm near a place then called Bug Tussle,

but now known as Flowery Mound. His father also worked in nearby coal mines.

ALBERT attended Flowery Mound rural school and McAlester High School, where his scholarship and campus activity won him the class presidency. In 1927 he entered the University of Oklahoma to major in political science. He became active in debating and won the National Oratorical Championship of 1928 with a prize of \$1,500.

At college he was president of the student council in his senior year. He was chosen for Phi Beta Kappa, honorary scholastic society, and won a Rhodes scholarship which enabled him to study for 3 years at Oxford University, where he took degrees in jurisprudence and in civil law.

He was admitted to the bar in Oklahoma and practiced with the Federal Housing Administration in Oklahoma City. Later he joined the legal staff of the Ohio Oil Co. In 1941 he enlisted in the Army as a private, won a Bronze Star for meritorious service in the Pacific and was discharged in 1946 with the rank of lieutenant colonel. That same year he won election to his congressional seat, with the campaign slogan "From a cabin in the cotton to Congress."

MOVED UP IN 1962

In 1955 he was made majority whip in Congress and in January 1962 he became the majority leader when Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, moved from that post to the speakership of the House on the death of Sam Rayburn of Texas.

ALBERT spends long hours on his job at the Congress, but he enjoys Masonic and Methodist Church affairs when the time allows. For relaxation he plays tournament bridge, reads extensively in history and polishes up his fluent command of Spanish by listening to recordings and reading and practicing the language.

ALBERT dresses conservatively and projects his nonaggressive nature in everything he does. He always seems to have a worried look on his face, but his hair is still brown and his manners are gentle and courteous. Among intimates he exhibits an impressive talent for mimicry.

While on Army duty in Washington in the war years he met and married the former Miss Mary Sue Green Harmon of Columbia, S.C. They have two children, Mary Frances, 14, and David Ernest, 8.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the wars of the 20th century have played a major role in the lives of the world's nations, but for the Lithuanians they have been drastic turning points. After 120 years of subjugation by the Russian czars, this Baltic country emerged from the First World War as an independent nation. The 45th anniversary of this happy event is being celebrated this month. Unfortunately, the Lithuanian Republic did not outlive the peace. For the second time it became a battleground in the struggle between Germans and Russians. After World War I the Lithuanians had been able to free themselves from a Russia torn internally by revolu-

tion and weakened by the war effort, but the Russians of 1945 were much more powerful and held Eastern Europe in an iron grip.

Lithuania thus remained under the Russian yoke as a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. The story of the post-war period has been one of increasing regimentation imposed by the Central Soviet Government, infiltration by Russians, and suppressions of religious and cultural freedoms. If the First World War meant national liberation for the Lithuanians, the Second World War meant enslavement. This is a lesson which we must all keep in mind as we work toward the establishment of a lasting peace.

Overwhelming Majority of Accidents Are Caused by Drivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on February 7, 1963, Mr. William H. G. France, president of the National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing, Inc., delivered an address before the Beavers' Club at the Detroit Athletic Club. Mr. France, who makes a great contribution to the automobile field, is not only an outstanding citizen, but in the particular area of safety on the highways and matters relating to automobiles, particularly racing cars, he is the preeminent expert that we have in the United States. In his speech Mr. France discussed the numerous reasons why the national image of the automobile industry needs to be changed in regards to accidents. Mr. France stated that the American public should be taught that the overwhelming majority of accidents stems from the drivers themselves and not from any faults of the machines.

Mr. France also expressed the importance and commonsense of advertising automobiles on the strength of their quality and their performance. His remarks are based upon his many years of experience in the field. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OVERWHELMING MAJORITY OF ACCIDENTS ARE CAUSED BY DRIVERS

(Address by William H. G. France)

Mr. President, Mr. Toastmaster, and members of the Beavers, it is a great pleasure to have been invited to meet you, and to be here today, and I want to thank you for having me. Maybe, I needed a change from all the warm Florida weather. Actually, I believe all of us need occasionally to leave our personal vantage points, if for no other reason than to sharpen our perspectives. And, I thank you for giving me that opportunity.

Now, I have a request to make. It's an unusual one, but I believe after you hear it,

all of you will agree with me that it is reasonable, and makes a great deal of sense.

I would like to ask that the swimming pool—this one right here along side us—be drained. If not to the bottom, then down to two or three inches.

Let me explain:

I read a speech a few weeks ago, that was delivered to a group of advertising men, which not only scared me, but set me to thinking. Some of you might possibly have heard the speech, or read it in the papers.

The talk was made by a man prominent in the automobile industry, and in it this gentleman almost came to tears over the speed of automobiles and the glamorization of automobiles and their speed. He intimated, if intimated is strong enough a word, that fast cars were unsafe, that fast cars were largely responsible for automobile accidents and fatalities, and that to glamorize a fast car was as dangerous as scattering ground glass in a kindergarten sand lot.

Only passing mention was made of the generally accepted belief that the people who drive cars—not the cars—are responsible for the great majority of accidents. People were safe, sound and sensible, the speech implied, but not cars. Government regulation of cars, Government restriction on automobile manufacturers, were hinted at. More than hinted at.

Well, if the speaker was right—and I am positive he was as wrong as smoking in church—then we must assume that all inanimate objects are dangerous and offer a dire threat to life.

Like this swimming pool. It should be drained to protect people from it. If not drained, then made so shallow that it can't leap up and drown us. It is possible if the man was right about cars—that the Government will forbid pools that are over 4 inches deep, and a manufacturer of pools who glamorizes them will be punished. The Government might go so far as to order lakes drained, river channels limited to a few feet in depth, wells and springs dried up and bathers allowed to enter the ocean only during low tide.

On the subject of safety, I believe I can say that few men in the country are more concerned with automobile safety than I. As a director of NASCAR racing activities in the United States, I suppose it is believed that speed and more speed is our chief objective. That isn't true. We spend much more time on safety measures, building against accidents, than we do on speed. Frankly, we would be out of business without safety.

In 1962 NASCAR sanctioned, assisted and kept complete records on more than 1,200 competitive racing events all over the country. What do you think the average speed of the winners of these 1,200 races was? Take a guess—150 miles an hour? 120? 100? 95? Nope. Much too high. The average speed in 95 percent of these races was under 60 miles an hour.

On January 20 of this year, NASCAR directed the Riverside, Calif., 500 miles NASCAR road race, which was won by Dan Gurney in a 1963 1/2 Ford. Gurney, one of the world's top drivers, won at a speed under 90 miles per hour (84.9). Every manufacturer in the United States—and I repeat every manufacturer—makes a car that will travel as fast as that.

If they didn't, their cars wouldn't be safe. That's right, wouldn't be safe. A car has to be capable of that speed, or better, to have the horsepower for the acceleration needed to enter and travel on the existing freeways and turnpikes of this country. And these expressways, in the future, are going to require even better performance on the part of American cars.

Gentlemen, something that greatly concerns me is the fact that no one has ever adequately gotten across to the newspapers

February 18

A744

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

sign-trained adults who pose as student leaders are obviously not bona fide students.

Some demands of this reformist group are seen reasonable, such as more government funds for education and less diverted to the pockets of officials, elimination of tuition in public schools, scholarships for deserving students, and more realistic curriculum. This type of demand presumably has the support of the entire student body.

The same university group spearheaded action in a student congress in December to seek the permanent neutralization of the Republic of Panama. The students made a formal request to the Panama Government to have the United Nations proclaim the permanent neutrality of the Republic of Panama and guarantee the neutralization of the Panama Canal.

The students said the Panama Canal was built to bring together all nations for international good and that this could be done only through maintenance of peace and good relations. They contended that the presence of U.S. military forces in the Canal Zone was detrimental to the stated purpose of the Panama Canal and made it a "risk zone" and invited enemy attack.

Some observers here see this student demand as a Communist- or Castro-influenced attempt to get United Nations action to remove long-established U.S. Army, Navy, and Air Force establishments from the Canal Zone and to reduce the military influence of the United States in Latin America.

1961 or the confrontation over offensive weapons in 1962. It may take Congress to smoke that out.

There should be an investigation by a responsible committee, preferably the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. A partisan investigation by Senator EMMETT DIXON, Republican of Illinois, and his Senate Republican Policy Committee is not desirable in this delicate matter. Neither is a rush of everybody to get into the act.

Yet this seems to be what is happening. It's not just DIXON. Senator WAYNE MOORE, Democrat of Oregon, has scheduled hearings before his Latin American Affairs Subcommittee starting today. Senator BARRY GOLDBERG, Republican of Arizona, plans an investigation by the Armed Services Committee, of which Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat of Georgia, is chairman and GOLDBERG is a member.

The public needs to know, officially, from official sources, what is going on (with private sources as a supplement and a yardstick). The best way is for a congressional committee to get statements and answers to questions from high administration officials. But one committee is enough.

Cuba
**Renegotiation of Guantanamo Lease a
Prime Purpose of Castro and Soviet
Russia**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, Members of the Senate are well aware that the Veterans of Foreign Wars, along with many others of our veterans organizations, have long recognized the fundamental and continuing dangers posed by a Red Cuba. I would like to invite the attention of the Senate to a statement recently made by the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Byron Gentry. This statement goes to the heart of the issues involved, pointing out that one of Castro's and Soviet Russia's prime purposes in their Caribbean machinations is to force the United States to renegotiate its lease on the Guantanamo Naval Base. Mr. Gentry rightly points out:

The only thing involved in the issue of U.S. control over Guantanamo Bay is the security of our country and that is not negotiable.

I commend his statement to the Senate's attention. I ask that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

KANSAS CITY, Mo.—Byron B. Gentry, Pasadena, Calif., national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, today urged that any negotiations that might be going on between the United States and Russia or Cuba regarding the U.S. base in Guantanamo be immediately halted.

"We firmly believe," Commander Gentry said, "the only thing involved in the issue of the U.S. control over Guantanamo Bay is the security of our country and that is not negotiable."

Commander in Chief Gentry added, "The most persistent demand of the Soviet Union and Castro's Red Cuba since the beginning of the Cuban missile crisis has been for U.S. withdrawal from Guantanamo Bay. There is no doubt but what the diplomatic maneuvering by Russia and Cuba is designed to force the United States to negotiate concerning this base so vital to our security, and that all of the Americas. It is abundantly clear now, the Communists want the United States out of Guantanamo Bay. They know full U.S. control of Guantanamo Bay is essential to the defense of the Caribbean Gulf of Mexico, and the Atlantic approach to Panama against the increasing encroachment of Red submarines in that area. Withdrawal from Guantanamo would be virtually impossible for the United States to ensure the maintenance of the Atlantic lanes between North and South America."

Continuing, Commander Gentry said, "The United States has no reason for apologetics to anyone for our position at Guantanamo Bay. We are there by virtue of a treaty arrived at between the United States and the Government of Cuba negotiated in 1903. It is particularly noteworthy that these treaty arrangements were reaffirmed in 1934 between the United States and Cuba. The United States is, in every living up to its obligations under the treaty. The agreement is imperturbable and cannot be terminated unilaterally."

"It is the firm conviction of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that our Nation should resolutely reject the demands of these arrogant Communist demagogues to negotiate our use of Guantanamo Bay if the United States bends to such threats, our Nation will quickly lose the security it has gained as a result of President Kennedy's direct and forceful handling of the Cuban missile issue."

"To give up Guantanamo would be a loss to the United States of a strategically important base, but such a loss would be compounded by the fact that as soon as the base is sailed out, Russian submarines would quickly become a threat from which Soviet submarines could threaten the Caribbean and prowls the U.S. Gulf of Mexico and our east coast."

"The Veterans of Foreign Wars reported President Kennedy's statement in December 1962, that 'we must make it clear to Castro once and for all that we will not give up our naval base at Guantanamo under any circumstances.'"

Youth Employment

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's special message of February 14 on our Nation's youth included a section on youth employment. The President referred to programs which would provide useful jobs and training for young persons who need them. The 1964 budget recommendations include two distinct activities. First, a Youth Conservation Corps would be established putting young men to work improving our forests and recreation areas. It would initially provide useful training and work for 15,000 youths. Second, the Federal Government will provide the wages and related costs for young persons employed on local projects that

Cuba
What Goes on in Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent editorial which appeared in the Des Moines Register of January 28, 1963. This editorial discusses the need for an investigation of the administration's handling of the Cuban situation.

The editorial is as follows:

WHAT GOES ON IN CUBA?

Americans had hoped that after the forced removal of Soviet offensive weapons from Cuba, the Soviet Government would quietly and gradually reduce also its defensive military manpower and equipment on the big island 90 miles off U.S. shores. Instead, new shipments of arms have gone in, and the sizable remaining Soviet military forces there have been regrouped and their encampments strengthened, and they are teaching Cubans to operate the new equipment.

Information about the new shipments and the new construction comes from Tad Szulc of the New York Times through private reports from Havana, leaks from U.S. Government officials, and from speeches by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican of New York.

In such a vital matter, this is not the best way for the public to become informed. Szulc and KEATING are entitled to credit for their enterprise and outpokenness. But the Government itself ought to be reporting from time to time on the results of the surveillance which it has continued ever since well before last fall's Cuban crisis. The blockade ended November 20. The watch did not. Perhaps, the enterprise of Szulc and KEATING will smoke out the administration.

The public has never really had the full story of either the Bay of Pigs invasion of

So Arlington State College patterns its academic program to suit its particular kind of student, as well as to meet the economic, scientific, and technological manpower needs of Dallas and Fort Worth.

Its students are mostly big-city residents. Ninety percent are commuters, mostly in their own cars. More than 30 percent carry less than a full academic load because of the demands of a job.

Quite a few have jobs which depend on their continuing their education at Arlington State College.

Because so many students work in the daytime, Arlington State College classes run from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. All are credit courses.

Many Arlington State College students take 7 years to get a degree, and a lot of others never graduate.

A good many young people choose Arlington State College for 2-year courses which equip them for jobs or for further study at other schools.

Enormously popular with employers of Dallas and Fort Worth is Arlington's Technical Institute Division, a 2-year program leading to an associate-in-science diploma.

This division produces engineering technicians, and has 475 students presently enrolled.

"We can place three to five times as many engineering technicians as we can turn out," says Dean Nedderman.

The technicians work with engineers—to keep computers going, operate powerplants, serve as highway construction foremen, supervise factory production lines, and so on.

In the field of art, Arlington State College offers a 2-year program including design, fashion illustrating, and interior decoration. Students who finish this course may either go on into an art career or transfer their credits to North Texas State University, Texas Christian University, or other schools which award an art degree.

A 2-year program in secretarial skills—including office accounting and operation of office machines—equips girls for office jobs.

Credits in a 2-year architecture course are transferable to any school which offers advanced training in this field.

Many of Arlington State College's growing pains center around the parking problem. More than 6,000 student cars are registered.

Much of the new land being acquired by the college will be devoted to parking—and the master plan calls for another 50 acres to add to the present 100.

"By 1980, we expect to have multistory parking garages," says Dr. Woolf.

"One of the problems of a large school is the time it takes to get between classes. We are seeking to develop a compact building complex."

For example, a four-floor men's dormitory now under construction will eventually rise to seven stories.

Arlington State College is also building a new dormitory for girls, a \$2 million science building, and a \$1,500,000 library.

Just off the campus, the O'Meara-Chandler Building and Development Co. of Houston is erecting a privately owned 3-story dormitory for 300 to 350 girls—with 2 swimming pools and electric built-in hair dryers.

A \$2 million auditorium to seat 6,000 for convocation and 4,000 for stage presentations and indoor games is in Arlington State College's master plan—but it will depend on friends instead of taxpayers. Available State building funds are too desperately needed for classrooms and laboratories.

College officials are quietly approaching individuals, corporations, and foundations in an attempt to raise money to build the auditorium.

Their pitch: The auditorium would add to an Arlington State College education "brilliance which comes from experience in open forum, from cultural attractions, from taking part in scholarly and professional con-

vocations and from the inspiration of great speakers on religious, social, and governmental topics."

Arlington State College's location between two big cities has helped to attract a high-level staff of educators, says Dr. Woolf.

Its faculty of 270 includes a generous number of holders of the Ph. D. degree. While not a perfect yardstick, the Ph. D. has become an accepted measure of academic status in today's world.

More than 40 percent of Arlington State College's science teachers hold Ph. D. degrees—and more than 50 percent of the engineering school faculty.

Arlington State College traces its beginning to 1895.

In that year, a private academy known as Arlington College was opened on the campus.

It was followed by three other private schools—Carlisle Military Academy, Arlington Training School and Arlington Military Academy—before it became a State junior college in 1917 with the name of Grubbs Vocational College.

The junior college became a part of the Texas A. & M. College system.

In 1923, the legislature voted to call the school North Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, a name which stuck for 26 years. Thousands of Texans still think of the school as a cow college.

In 1949, then the largest State-supported junior college in the Southwest, the name was changed to Arlington State College. The school was raised to senior college rank in 1959, and Dr. Woolf became its president the same year, succeeding the late Dr. E. H. Hereford.

Dr. Woolf and his associates have worked overtime to upgrade curriculum, faculty, and plant, to assure high-quality education for its ever-increasing crowds of young scholars.

Women students are increasing at an even faster rate than men, though the ratio is still 5 men to 1 woman student.

Several dozen Negroes are among Arlington State College's 9,197 students, and were integrated without any problem, college officials and students agree.

More significant, perhaps is the peaceful coexistence of thousands of Dallas students and thousands from Fort Worth. No signs of the ancient civic feud between the two cities appear around the campus.

Conceivably, Arlington State College might become the catalyst to transform the ancient rivalry of the neighbor cities into a shared pride in the whole metropolitan area.

President Kennedy, Secretary of State Rusk, and Secretary of Defense McNamara Speak on the Cuban Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, the Cuban situation continues to be of concern to Members of Congress and to the Nation as a whole. In this connection, in my weekly newsletter to the people of the Fourth District of Tennessee, I have discussed the Cuban situation and recent developments.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my newsletter be reprinted in the Appendix of the Record.

The newsletter follows:

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Cuba and its Communist government continue to be the subject of great public interest and concern as the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense this week made statements on our Cuban policy.

The President has taken a firm stand on Cuba. Last October when it became known that Russian weapons designed primarily for offensive purposes had been landed in Cuba and were being deployed, the President ordered a naval blockade of Cuba and demanded that they be withdrawn. These missiles and bombers were dismantled and removed from Cuba.

Since this time the United States has continued our air surveillance of the island with both low-flying aircraft and with high-altitude planes of the U-2 design.

Recently, Secretary of Defense McNamara, in a lengthy report, told the American people that since July 1 of last year more than 400 reconnaissance flights have been flown over Cuba by our U.S. military aircraft, and that the photographs taken on these flights, plus other intelligence sources, indicate clearly that the offensive weapons have been removed from Cuba.

In addition to Secretary of Defense McNamara, President Kennedy, Secretary of State Rusk, and Mr. John McCone, Director of our Central Intelligence Agency, have all stated quite positively that, while we are concerned, they are satisfied that Cuba no longer poses a real military threat to the United States or to other countries in this hemisphere.

In a further action directed against Cuba, President Kennedy has ordered recently a further crackdown on Cuban shipping which will further shrink the already substantially reduced trade with Cuba from the free world.

While partisan attacks are continually being made on the administration because of our Cuban policy, the President has taken a firm stand and is working to strengthen our position while also working toward the removal of all Soviet troops from Cuba—this short of war. In international affairs we generally tend to close ranks at the water's edge, and follow a bipartisan policy of cooperation, however some would use the Cuban situation for partisan attacks and political gain.

Secretary Rusk in a major speech this week in California called for an early withdrawal of the remaining Soviet troops in Cuba and said that the administration is working toward having these troops removed.

"The authorities in Moscow and Havana must recognize that Soviet military elements in Cuba do not insure the peace of Cuba, but poison the atmosphere and increase the dangers," Rusk said. "The sooner this source of potential trouble is eliminated, the better for everyone concerned."

"We in the Western Hemisphere cannot accept as normal any Soviet military presence in this hemisphere," the Secretary said. He asserted that Cuba will not become a base for offensive military operations against the United States or other countries and pledged "the Armed Forces of the United States" to maintain this position.

Littlejohn Family Military Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an interesting letter from Mr. Thomas C.

Littlejohn, Sr., of Cowpens, S.C., was printed in the January 10 issue of the *Spartanburg Guide of Spartanburg*. It deals with the military record of the Littlejohn family. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LITTLEJOHN MILITARY RECORD

Cantigny is a small village in Northeast France. After the great German offensive in March 1918, the German line ran west to Montdidier and formed a small salient. The First Division was ordered to take the village under the command of Gen. Robert Lee Bullard. The 28th Infantry, under the command of Col. Hanson Ely, took Cantigny on May 28, 1918. That was the first American battle of World War I. The Germans counterattacked for 3 days but failed to retake the village from the Americans. Two hundred and fifty prisoners were taken.

The division went to France in 1917. I served in Company I, 28th Infantry under Captain Tack and Lt. Robert Purdy, Jr. Judge Purdy of Sumter, S.C., said his son was killed in action.

I was awarded the Silver Star, a medal rated third in the U.S. Army, by General Summerall. I was wounded on May 31, 1918, and awarded the Purple Heart and the Victory Medal. I am rated one of the third most seriously wounded veterans in the United States and in 1959 there was only about 87 men with these degrees of wounds in the United States.

I and Mrs. Littlejohn reside on the Battleground Road, Cowpens, S.C. We have four sons: Joseph A., who served in World War II and was awarded the Purple Heart Medal and Good Conduct Medal; Joseph A. Littlejohn was pinned down in advance of his men. He pinned down the Germans with about three shots and return to his lines with a partly loaded gun. Dr. Oliver M., who received the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart and Good Conduct Medal; Dr. Oliver M. Littlejohn had a bullet to pierce a hole in his helmet. Dr. Thomas C., Jr., who served in the U.S. Air Service, is entitled to the American Campaign Medal, Asiatic Pacific Campaign Medal, Gilbert W., who served in the U.S. Army during the Korean War. He is now captain in the U.S. Army Reserve. He was awarded the Army Occupation Medal.

THOMAS C. LITTLEJOHN, Sr.

COWPENS, S.C.

Address of National Commander Powers at American Legion Law and Order Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, among the outstanding events in the enriching program of the American Legion in Chicago is the Annual Law and Order Banquet of Chicago Police Post No. 207. National Commander James E. Powers gave recognition to the importance and significance of this law and order banquet by accepting the invitation of the post to be the principal speaker at this year's dinner.

At the request of members of the Chicago Police Post No. 207 for whom I have high esteem because of the contribution they are making to our city and our country, I am extending my remarks to include the complete text of the address of the national commander of the American Legion on this memorable occasion. The address follows:

LAW AND ORDER SPEECH BY JAMES E. POWERS, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE CHICAGO POLICE POST NO. 207, CHICAGO, ILL., FEBRUARY 12, 1963

Thank you Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and my fellow Legionnaires of Chicago Police Post No. 207. I am so very pleased with opportunity to visit with you on the occasion of this now traditional law and order banquet, and to talk to this fine group of Legionnaires whose chosen profession it is to uphold the law of the land and to maintain order in your home community.

This is sworn objective of all Legionnaires everywhere, but for you who wear the badge of honor of law enforcement officers it is a way of life. For the rest of us who wear the badge of honor of the American Legion, it is our duty as citizens to assist you wherever and whenever possible in carrying out your daily tasks.

At the very outset, I wish to make it clear that we believe this to be the duty of every citizen and not only that of the American Legionnaire. Ours is a nation which depends upon the fair and equal dispensation of justice to all her people, regardless of their station in life. The first step in that orderly process which differentiates us from the totalitarian state is the fair and equal enforcement of the law of the land.

The lot of the policeman is not always an easy one. Your every action is subject to public scrutiny through the eyes of our news media, and through your many personal contacts made in the daily conduct of your work. You are the first person every honest and upright citizen seeks when he is in need of assistance. You are avoided like the plague by those shady characters who live on the edge of the law or who make a career of evading it.

The risk of life and limb is an occupational hazard which you have accepted without question. Yours is a paradoxical existence. You are the butt of jokes, the objects of scorn, the target of the sensation seeker. At the same time you are the defender of the weak, the hope of the oppressed, and, in a much broader sense my friends—you are important to freedom.

I say you are important to freedom, because, in the words of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who delivered the keynote address before our 1962 national convention: "Crime and subversion are formidable problems in the United States today because, and only because, there is a dangerous flaw in the Nation's moral armor."

Note well that Mr. Hoover did not say that you are at fault, but I do say that you are important to freedom because you are the Nation's first line of defense against these evil influences which threaten to undermine the moral integrity of America.

I pledge to the law enforcement agencies of this land the full support of the American Legion as we stand at your side in the front lines of this fight. While yours is basically the task of bringing the wrongdoer to justice, we believe that ours is the responsibility of keeping them from becoming wrongdoers in the first place.

Director Hoover further told the assembled convention delegates that ours is "an idealistic nation—a nation ruled by laws, not by men. Yet each year shows new record peaks of crime and lawlessness."

"Crime," he continued, "is a parasite, feeding upon public disinterest and moral leth-

argy." And he cited some alarming statistics which brought home to all of us the real seriousness of the situation. "This day," he said, "more than 5,200 felonies—4 serious crimes every minute—will be committed across the United States."

He said that since 1946 our national crime totals have more than doubled, and that over the years since 1957 crime totals have risen five times as fast as the rate of population growth, and, even more alarmingly, the group which accounts for the largest increase in our crime rate is among youngsters under 18 years of age.

Somewhere, my friends, we have lost our touch, and I suspect that it is not as law enforcement officer—but as parents—particularly since this tremendous increase in crime rates among our young people is so pronounced.

Obviously the moral standards of the Nation must be shored up. We are in need of a revival of integrity, and a renewed emphasis upon teaching the real values of life and the responsibilities of solid citizenship to our young people—and these responsibilities lie in the home, the church, and the school, where young minds are molded and true character is developed.

In other words, it is the responsibility of every one of us, not only to teach proper standards of conduct and morality, but by our own example to instill in the minds of our young people a clear-cut, black and white difference between right and wrong, and to provide them with the incentive to do right, rather than wrong.

Parental concern for the child and his future transcends the family relationship and enters into the realm of concern for the future of this great Nation of ours. Our youngsters of today are the hope of America of tomorrow, and we adult citizens of today must put our own house in order, for only by so doing can we properly provide our children with a set of standards to live by.

We can no longer afford to be so engrossed with the material things of life in this land of abundance, that we lose all sight of the moral and spiritual values that have made America what she is today. If we continue to indulge ourselves totally in the day-to-day quest of the almighty dollar at the expense of all other facets of life, we may well see the day when this is no longer a land of abundance, but a jungle of fear and a land of lawlessness.

Yet, if anyone still insists on evaluating this situation strictly on a dollars and cents basis it can be pointed out to the materialists that crime in this country now cost the American people about \$60 million a day. This figure, of course, gives no consideration to such factors as personal grief, broken homes, mental and physical anguish, and the blight upon American prestige in the family of nations.

Furthermore, we find that where strong moral convictions are lacking, where crime flourishes, and where people are lethargic, that the seeds of communism fall on fertile ground.

We know that the Communist Party, U.S.A., while in open defiance of the law of the land by refusing to register with the Government as an alien agent despite a U.S. Supreme Court ruling upholding the law requiring such registration, continues to spread its insidious propaganda throughout the land. One of their prime targets is the youth of America, as their speakers' bureau of top CPUSA functionaries seek audiences on the campuses of our colleges and universities from coast to coast.

These are matters that should be of vital concern to every American citizen who loves his country and is concerned about the future of America. They are matters of concern to the American Legion—and have been since the founding days of our organization.

Appendix

Miami and Cuban Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, within the past several years the city of Miami has undergone a tremendous change. Through its portals have passed over 180,000 homeless Cuban exiles seeking refuge from the tyrannical yoke of Castro's Communist regime. While many of the exiles have resettled elsewhere in the United States and abroad, the great majority have remained in the Miami area. Such a gigantic influx of poor, non-English speaking people is certain to cause problems for any city and in this respect Miami is no exception. I add that the reason these people are poor is that they were forced to leave Cuba without being permitted to carry any of their worldly possessions with them. What is unique, however, is the way in which the Cubans have been assimilated into Miami's society and how two divergent groups have learned to live together in harmony and brotherhood.

The story of Miami's transition is well-told in a recent article from the Washington Daily News by the noted writer Richard Starnes.

The remarkable thing about the story of Miami and the Cuban refugees—

Mr. Starnes states, is that what—could have easily become a squalid chronicle of suspicion, fear and hate, has turned out to be a chapter of contemporary history that all Americans ought to be proud of.

As a tribute to the people responsible for Miami's "success story"—the Cuban exiles and the residents of Miami—I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Starnes' article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIAMI AND CUBAN REFUGEES

(By Richard Starnes)

MIAMI.—Take a city the size of this one (291,688 in the 1960 census) and in 2 years superimpose another city on it—a city largely made up of penniless refugees who speak no English, a city totaling 153,000 people.

These people will immediately become eligible for a Federal dole and surplus food from Federal warehouses, neither of which is available to Miamians. They will compete furiously for jobs in a labor market already badly depressed. They will occupy a huge area of the city and, inevitably, change it into a ghetto where English is seldom heard.

All these things have happened to Miami as the result of the deluge of refugees from

Castro's Cuba. There have been, of course, a host of irritants in the wake of this invasion. There have been resentments, and there is still a small, ugly core of prejudice against these people who abandoned their homeland because they loved freedom more.

But the remarkable thing about the story of Miami and the Cuban refugees is the fact that the irritants have been minor and are slowly vanishing, that the incidents are diminishing as understanding grows, that the dismal reservoir of prejudice is no larger than it is. A story that could easily have become a squalid chronicle of suspicion, fear, and hate, has turned out to be a chapter of contemporary history that all Americans ought to be proud of.

The credit for this belongs, of course, principally to the people involved—the people of Miami and the Cuban refugees—with a big assist from the farseeing and compassionate program of assistance set up by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Cuban Refugee Center, which recently celebrated its second birthday anniversary, is directed by Marshall Wise, a HEW official whose field is social security, not refugees.

"I got the job," he told me, "because I somehow got the name for being a close man with a buck, I was managing the social security office here in Miami, and when they called me to set up the refugee program they said, 'We're going to have to spend a lot of money, but we don't want it thrown around, and we don't want any scandal.'"

On the record, HEW's choice of a head man for the refugee program looks good. A lot of money has been spent (more than \$71 million in direct cash relief to the refugees, for example) but the accomplishments of the program are genuinely impressive. More than a third of the refugees have been resettled in cities all over the United States. Resettlement is an easy word to say, but a tough job to accomplish.

In many cases it meant teaching English to adults who had never heard it spoken; in all cases it meant finding jobs, transporting families, coaching new communities to accept the refugees. The rate of failure in the resettlement program? Less than 2 percent.

This figure is good testimony to the sort of people who have fled Castro. There are other statistics, equally impressive. No refugee has been involved in a major crime. Juvenile delinquency and illegitimacy (two prime indices of social decay) apparently do not exist among the refugees at all.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last week, a number of us paid tribute to the former free Republic of Lithuania on its 45th anniversary of independence.

The following is a proclamation issued

by the Governor of the State of Indiana, Hon. Matthew E. Welsh, and the mayor or Gary, Ind., John Visclosky, commemorating the occasion:

STATE OF INDIANA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Indianapolis, January 16, 1963.

ALBERT G. VINICK,
President,

PETER INDRIEKAS,
Secretary, Lithuanian American Council,
Lake County, Ind., East Chicago, Ind.

GENTLEMEN: It is gratifying to me, as Governor of the State of Indiana, to call to the attention of all citizens that the date, February 16, 1963, will mark the 45th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania which, with other Baltic States, has been ravaged by the forces of communism.

It is appropriate that we join the citizens of our State, of Lithuanian descent, in the observance so significant to them and to all who oppose domination and oppression. We, whose forefathers also fought the battle against tyranny, are happy to unite in the celebration of this memorable event, with the hope that their nation and all nations which have suffered similar plight, may soon rejoice in the restoration of their freedom and independence.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW E. WELSH,
Governor.

— — —
PROCLAMATION BY THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF GARY, IND.

"Whereas February 16, 1963, will mark the 45th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania; and

"Whereas the result of the Stalin-Hitler conspiracy, the freedom-loving Lithuanian nation was forcibly deprived of its independence, and subjected to unscrupulous practices of physical, religious, cultural, and economic destruction by the Soviet Union and its single ruling Communist Party; and

"Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to alien domination and oppression, and are determined to regain freedom and independence; and

"Whereas the act of Soviet aggression on Lithuania and other Baltic States has been never recognized by the United States, and as long as America and its democratic form of government survives, there will be hope in Lithuania and all ravaged nations of the earth for a better day to come; and

"Whereas the residents of this State, along with Americans in many other States of our great country, have a bond of sympathy and understanding with their fellow citizens of Lithuanian descent whose native land has been befallen by hard trials and tribulations under the brutal rule of the Kremlin masters: Now, therefore, I, John Visclosky, mayor of the city of Gary, Ind., proclaim Saturday, February 16, 1963, as Republic of Lithuania Day throughout the city of Gary and do urge all our citizens to give proper recognition to this day of special patriotic significance to their Lithuanian American fellow citizens and to join in such exercises as may be appropriate for the observance of this anniversary."

Dated this 31st day of January 1963.

JOHN VISCLOSKY,
Mayor.

A735

Arlington State College Adjusts to Rapid Growth; Serves Vital Texas Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 18, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Dallas Morning News recently published an article on an outstanding Texas educational institution, Arlington State College.

It is a story of a school that was elevated to senior college rank in 1959 and has outstripped its parent school, Texas A. & M., in enrollment, striving in the process to maintain a plant adequate to its increasing needs.

It is a success story in higher education, and a richly deserved tribute to the administration, faculty, and students of an outstanding school.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Helen B. Callaway, captioned "ASC Accustomed to Swift Change" be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ARLINGTON STATE COLLEGE ACCUSTOMED TO SWIFT CHANGE

(By Helen B. Callaway)

ARLINGTON, Tex.—When the first huge tidal wave of war babies engulfs American universities next September, Arlington State College will probably absorb its flood of freshmen efficiently and serenely.

This is because Arlington State College has grown accustomed to surging growth and swift change—sitting as it does in the heart of the exploding Dallas-Fort Worth population.

In 1952, Arlington State had 1,322 students. By 1957, 4,926 were enrolled. In 1963, 9,197 crowd the classrooms. And the school is braced for 20,000 by 1980.

Ninety percent of its present students come from Dallas and Tarrant Counties.

People who have not noticed Arlington State lately may be astonished to learn that the college has outgrown its strapping father school, Texas A. & M., in enrollment, operates in a \$15 million plant on a 100-acre campus, with a current budget of \$5,300,000, has millions of dollars worth of buildings under construction in a lively race to keep pace with enrollment, has become one of the major schools of engineering in the Southwest, with some 2,900 engineering majors, has a bigger total enrollment than Southern Methodist University, and almost as many Dallas County students (Arlington State College counts 4,040 from Dallas County, Southern Methodist University 4,230).

Arlington State's young and vigorous administration is headed by 38-year-old President Jack R. Woolf, an engineer by training, with a doctor of philosophy degree from Purdue. A native Texan, Dr. Woolf came to Arlington State College from A. & M.

Other key people in the administration include the deans of the college's two schools—Dr. S. T. Keim, Jr., arts and sciences, and Dr. W. H. Nedderman, engineering.

"People still ask us," says Dr. Woolf, smiling, "when we are going to become a senior college."

Arlington State passed that milestone more than 3 years ago, and the question now is when it will add a graduate school.

It is believed to be the Nation's largest senior college without graduate training.

Dr. Woolf believes that the high-quality faculty which Arlington State College has been building up the last few years is fully capable of teaching graduate courses.

A graduate school would be a logical development, he feels.

"It is vital in higher education today," President Woolf notes, to "keep your faculty alive."

He explains:

"Your sociology professor needs to do creative writing. Your electrical engineering expert has to be in the swim of an engineers society. Your teacher of English needs to participate in social concerns of his field.

"Research, consulting work and graduate teaching are three of the most important ways to keep a faculty alive." Many on the Arlington State College faculty already serve as consultants to industry, many are engaged in research.

Admittedly, a graduate school is a bit in the future.

"But whether in this way or in some other, we must expand," says Dr. Woolf.

It would have been surprising, perhaps, if this school had not shown tremendous growth of late. Its hometown of Arlington has changed from a village of 7,600 people in 1946 to a city of 54,000.

The growth of Arlington's big sister cities, Dallas and Fort Worth, is well known.

The 3-year-old senior college is geared to the space age and also to the north Texas business and cultural community of which it is a part.

Its officials point out that many professional fields of education thrive best in an urban setting.

"We are sitting right here in the middle of the financial, industrial, commercial, cultural, and population center of the whole Southwest," says Dr. Woolf.

The youngness of the senior college gives it some advantages peculiar to this astronaut age of constant and rapid change—a time when flexibility is becoming vital to survival.

Dr. Cothburn O'Neal, assistant to the president and professor of English, points out:

"We have had a unique opportunity here to staff our college with outstanding people, many of them young. We have little or no deadwood, virtually no entrenched incompetence."

Though perhaps best known for its engineering school with nearly 8,000 students, Arlington State College has an even greater number—3,300—majoring in business administration, a fat division of its arts and science school.

Sweeping changes have been made in the curriculum of both engineering and business administration in recent years—to match the revolutions which have transformed the world of industry.

Dr. Woolf comments:

"One advantage in starting out anew at a time of great change—as our senior college did—is that it is simpler to keep up with the new demands on higher education.

"We have no status quo to impede us, no vested interests to hold us back, no pet courses that could not be streamlined or replaced if necessary."

Emphasis in the business administration degree program, he explains, has shifted from typing-shorthand-bookkeeping to managerial skills.

Instrumentation and creativity now reign in the engineering labs—succeeding the banks of generators and motors which were so long standard equipment for engineering students.

Electronic brains and radio waves are examples of Arlington State College's modern laboratories of engineering.

If the average citizen of Big D and Fort

Worth has been unaware of the major new college which has grown up so fast between them, this is not so of big industrial and business interests.

Dr. Nedderman speaks to this point:

"Ling-Temco-Vought maintains an ideal cooperative plan with our school of engineering. The company annually credits outstanding high school seniors, and brings 15 to 30 of them to Arlington State College each year.

"These students alternately go to school full time for a semester and work in the Ling-Temco-Vought plant full time for a semester. Usually, they carry one night course while working, so as not to break the academic continuity.

"At Ling-Temco-Vought they work as part of a team, with engineers engaged in research. They achieve a maturity that most young people do not have by the time of graduation."

A number of other plants in the Dallas-Fort Worth area also have earn-and-learn arrangements with students at Arlington State College.

Dean Nedderman reports that Arlington State College graduates in five engineering specialties— aeronautical, civil, electrical, industrial, mechanical—are sought out by General Electric, Radio Corp. of America, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as well as firms closer home.

A good percentage of the graduates stay in the Dallas area to work for Ling-Temco-Vought, Texas Instruments, General Motors, Bell Helicopter, Dallas Power & Light Co., Texas Power & Light, General Dynamics, Southwest Airmotive, and other engineering industries.

"The thing we are proudest of in the school of engineering, though, is the performance of our graduates in well-known graduate schools," says Dean Nedderman.

"This is the acid test as to the caliber of product we are turning out.

"A number of our better students go on to do graduate work at universities from Cal Tech to Purdue, from Iowa State to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Without exception, all have done extremely well."

Arlington State College feels obliged to help meet the Dallas-Fort Worth needs for young business leaders as well as engineers. Here is how President Woolf puts it:

"In Texas, we must have management genius and technical competence to create new business and industry. As a stimulus to the Texas economy, the age of King Cotton and black gold is gone.

"The real need now is for brainpower in banking, insurance, management, science, engineering. A good solid engineer creates 100 jobs by his own ingenuity."

Though best known for engineering and business, Arlington State College believes strongly in a liberal arts and science education as a foundation for any profession—or as a worthy goal in itself.

Dean Keim of arts and sciences says:

"Our school has a basic objective to provide a general education as a basis for professional skills. We have an obligation to provide a liberal education for the 25 percent of our students who want only that."

Even the engineers must study social sciences and the humanities, "so they will assume responsibility for some of the monsters they are creating," says Engineer Woolf.

Quite a few young people choose Arlington State College for premed and prelaw training.

The personality of Arlington State is a bit different from that of most colleges its size.

Its average student is a trifle older and a little more serious about studies. He is less wrapped up in football and the bossa nova—though Arlington State College offers sports and social life a plenty for those who care.

The question: If \$75 a month is enough for the Government to pay, then why isn't it permitted to private business? Or, to put it another way, if \$75 isn't enough in private employment, why should the Government pay less?"

As we see young people idled by lack of odd jobs and out-of-school employment, summer or otherwise, we might ponder the effect of legislation which seems to favor Government while discriminating against private industry. Surely, the youngster who gets only \$75 a month from the Government is no better off than the one who gets \$75 a month from the butcher, the baker or the candlestick maker.

U.N. AGRICULTURAL AID TO COMMUNIST CUBA

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, with the announcement several days ago that the United Nations had granted agricultural aid to Cuba, considerable protest was voiced in this body. I was among those who protested.

In a statement for the RECORD on February 14, page 2110, I voiced my opposition to the action by the United Nations in granting aid to Communist Cuba. This act by the United Nations is an extremely unwelcome and discordant action. It puts the U.N. and the United States at odds over policy toward Cuba.

I stated at that time that I fully supported the investigation of this and related issues which has been undertaken in the other body and announced by Senator CHURCH. Because of the continuing protest of my constituents, I repeat that which I previously said:

This is a matter in which all of us—the Foreign Affairs Committee which has jurisdiction and the Members of this House—will continue to be vitally interested. It would appear timely to have a complete reassessment of the U.S. positions in the specialized programs of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all will agree with me that this body should not undertake an investigation similar in nature and scope to that being conducted by the other body. The facts are that the official U.S. position, with which I am in agreement was opposed to the granting of the aid, but we obviously did not have the votes in the Governing Council of the Special Fund to prevent the action. I am confident that the investigation in the other body will be sufficient on this matter. However, if it is not, then our committee which has jurisdiction will certainly undertake to fill in any gaps.

THE SINKING OF THE "MAINE"

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. O'HARA of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

"KING COAL" DYING FAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WAGGONER). Under previous order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for 30 minutes.

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, just before I left my office I received the attached correspondence from the White House.

At this time I would like to make it a part of the RECORD with a few comments:

FEBRUARY 13, 1963.

HON. JOHN H. DENT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The President has asked me to acknowledge your letter of February 7 expressing your concern over reports that changes were being contemplated in the residual fuel oil import control program that would weaken it.

Prior to April 1 the Department of the Interior must announce new quotas. They will probably base their allocations on the report of the Office of Emergency Planning. I was pleased to note that that report called for a continuation of the residual oil import control program.

I do not know to what extent existing quotas will be modified, but I will see that your letter is called to the attention of the Department of the Interior.

Thank you for writing.

Sincerely,

MYER FELDMAN,
Deputy Special Counsel,
to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I want to state for the RECORD that somewhere along the line the White House Deputy Counsel got his lines crossed.

The contrary is true. The Office of Emergency Planning has recommended the opposite to what Mr. Feldman states in that if the President follows its recommendations there will be complete abandonment of the residual oil control program.

Further, once the program falls by the wayside it will only be a matter of a few years or even months before the whole oil control program is abandoned.

This follows as night follows day, simply because to produce residual, an oil country must sell its crude.

One wonders how long the patriotic impulses of coal users in America can withstand the powerful inducement of fuel oil dumped into the United States at any price that undercuts the b.t.u. cost of coal.

"King Coal" may not be dead but his children are awful sick.

Mr. Speaker, my purpose in addressing the House today is to call to your attention the seriousness of the recommendation of the Office of Emergency Planning in the matter of imported residual oil.

I find no cause for joy in this recommendation nor do I find any shred of hope for the struggling communities of

our coal producing areas in the United States. If any joy is expressed it must be by the Venezuelans and the self-serving profiteers in the oil import and distribution system of the New England States.

For many years the domestic fuels industries have tried to work out the national fuels problems with cooperative studies and planning. Every time their efforts start to bring order out of chaos and the various industries and their dependents begin to level off into a reasonably productive era along comes the import lobby, and some nonelected political bureaucrat issues a come and get it order to the ever hungry international oil companies and their domestic bird dogs.

Director Edward McDermott recommendation will make this Nation dependent upon outside sources for our national fuel needs and eventually our petroleum industries will join the coal fields in their chronic depression and unemployment.

This Congress passed a coal research bill a few years ago. The people in this industry are being taxed millions of dollars for this purpose, to search out and find uses for coal in order to save the economy of our coal areas.

The greatest amount of research money has so far been allocated by Secretary Udall to the development of a process for turning coal into oil.

In the same breath the Secretary ordered more millions of barrels of oil from foreign countries to use in place of coal for fuel.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a joke is a joke but it is no joke to the thousands of destitute miners, their families and their communities.

We have deposits of coal to last for a period of 1,000 years at a 400 million ton-year production. During this thousand years there is no doubt that nuclear development will supplant coal as a basic fuel. The transition from mineral fuels to nuclear fuels will take time, time which will allow for the development of coal uses other than fuel, will give our mining industry a gradual phasing out and will allow our communities to adjust.

The open door policy of destroying the industry by the importation of foreign fuels does not allow the domestic industry or the domestic worker to participate in the employment or the profits of the substitute fuel.

It is a matter of record that there need be no residual oil left from the refinery process and actually under the label of residual waste we are being sold oil that rightfully belongs in the petroleum products industry and not in the fuel industry.

Some oil countries are producing residual at a rate 45 percent of the crude oil while here in the United States of America we are refining the crude in some cases without a single drop of residual waste.

Are we then buying waste or are we in fact buying a competitive fuel produced expressly for the U.S. market?

It is my humble opinion that the history of the decline of the coal industry

and it is impending demise is just a pattern that will be followed in the elimination of many of our domestic industries by the combined forces and greed of the internationalist importers, exporters and exploiters.

These groups have little or no allegiance to any nation. They jiggle their incomes and profit taxwise to pay as little as possible, they deal in dollar economies and completely ignore human economies.

I studied the tax picture of a large international American-based oil company and I have come up with some rather enlightening figures. Incidentally, if coal producers and their employees enjoyed the same consideration as oil companies, subsidized and tariff protected wheat and cotton growers, they would not worry about the profiting internationalists.

For too many years oil has enjoyed a position that has been described as "sacred and profitable."

Our administration is now trying to crack the sanctuary wall which has sheltered the profits of our international oil corporations. Middle East oil companies have long been protected by admirals, diplomats, and tax accountants. At the moment, our fleet and Air Force are making symbolic visits to Saudi Arabian ports and air fields to impress, warn, or reassure the various parties involved in the Yemen conflict—Nasser, Sallal, Faisal, and Hussein. But the Arabian American Oil Co.—Aramco—does not pay as much as the cost of an oil change for these maneuvers because, to the best of our knowledge, it has not been paying Federal income taxes to the United States.

All this is bewildering to most taxpayers—but it can be explained. Aramco's latest financial records are not public property, but a summary of 1955 and 1956 earnings, entered into a Senate debate in 1958, will suffice to offer tabular illustration—bearing in mind that the figures probably have risen in ensuing years by about 25 percent.

Aramco pays Saudi Arabia royalties, which are deducted from income. In addition, Aramco pays taxes to Saudi Arabia. These, like all foreign taxes, are treated as tax credits against U.S. taxes.

Here is the condensed Aramco financial statement:

(In millions)

	1955	1956
Total earnings	\$724.8	\$748.8
Deduct royalties of	78.4	80.8
Deduct costs and expenses of	181.0	188.3
Leaving an income of	465.4	480.2
From which deduct 27½ percent depletion allowance, based on income from crude	121.6	127.5
Leaving a U.S. taxable income of	343.2	352.7
U.S. taxes to Saudi Arabia total	178.4	183.4
	164.7	169.4
Therefore, Aramco paid no U.S. income taxes. Instead, it had an unused tax credit, which, under existing law could be applied as a credit against other income earned abroad, of	(14.2)	(16.0)

That excess tax credit is one of the targets of the new Kennedy tax reform. The President is seeking to prevent our

oil companies from using excess tax credits arising from crude oil operations as in the Middle East to offset U.S. tax liabilities on other forms or sources of foreign income, such as refining or distribution operations by affiliates in Europe or other parts of the world.

In another reform, the President proposes that deduction of foreign development costs should apply only to the income from these operations and should not be permitted to reduce the U.S. tax on domestic income.

The administration has not requested any reduction in the highly controversial 27½-percent depletion allowance. Past efforts by Senate liberals, like Senators Douglas, Proxmire, and Morse, to cut the allowance have been defeated in Congress. But the administration calculates that its reforms will save \$300 million—most of it from domestic oil operations. It proposes to cut the depletion allowance, indirectly, by strict enforcement of the ceiling—the existing statutory limitation of 50 percent of net income. This is to be accomplished by requiring corporations to charge drilling and development costs in computing their net income—a requirement that would not affect our overseas oil companies because their production costs are so low.

Would reduction of the depletion allowance affect the fortunes of our Middle East oil companies?

During past Senate debates, experts estimated that elimination of the Aramco depletion allowance in 1955 and 1956 would have gained as much as \$99 million for the U.S. Treasury. But spokesmen for the oil industry insist that any reduction in the depletion allowance for overseas operations would not have benefited the Treasury because the Arab governments would have merely increased taxes, thereby preempting the \$99 million for themselves.

But that argument presupposes that the amounts paid to Saudi Arabia are ordinary taxes, that they can be raised by unilateral action of the Saudi Arabian Government. In fact, the taxes are a component of total royalties which are negotiated—not enacted. It is true, of course, that Arab oil experts claim that the companies have made inordinate profits in the past and that the Arab governments are entitled to a larger share—the above table shows that Saudi Arabia's combined income from royalties and taxes totaled \$280 million in 1956. In 1961, the total was estimated at \$350 million.

What about the impact on prices? In the past, the oil companies have posted high prices for crude oil because the size of their depletion allowance depended on their gross receipts from crude oil sales. In consequence, the companies' own refineries, and those of their customers, have shown very little profit. This may also have boosted the bills of consumers, our friends and allies in Europe, as well as the U.S. Navy and Air Force.

In recent years, however, the price structure has been cracking for other reasons; Soviet competition and spec-

tacular oil strikes in Africa have ended monopoly. And the administration proposals may hasten this process.

We do not know how much the new Treasury proposals will cost Middle East companies. One guess puts it at between \$25 and \$50 million. But large oil companies may come out ahead in any event because of the proposed reduction in the U.S. corporation tax.

Domestic oil companies will surely fight the President's proposals on the hill. It will be interesting to observe the extent to which foreign policy considerations will influence the debate.

If the past is any criteria in all probability considerations for the foreign potentates and ruling cliques will supersede the economic consideration in this area of State-Commerce Department activities.

Fellow Members, in these trying days of continuing, and in many industries, expanding unemployment, one wonders if we have a true concept of the basic requirements for a healthy and growing economy in an industrial complex.

For too many years we have placed in first consideration the welfare of certain industries and in some cases certain countries and have given second or no consideration to other industries and our own economic well being.

There has grown up in this country, either by design or by accident, a feeling that ours is an unlimited and boundless horn of plenty, with no bottom, no ceiling, and the sides stretching beyond the horizons.

This is not true in the balance of human endeavors, desires, ambitions, wants, and needs. It is especially untrue in the field of trade economics.

It is only true in the minds of those whose well-being is not dependent upon the daily struggle to keep "their bellies full."

No reasonable person objects to helping a neighbor, be he next door or at the far corners of the earth. Any reasonable person can object however, when we lose sight of the simple economic fact that one must always maintain the ability to provide help in order to give help.

The coal industry is a case in point. No industry has performed so well in updating its production facilities in its relationship with mine labor and finally in its efforts to introduce new needs and uses for their product.

All this, however, has failed to keep the job opportunities in this industry at a rate required for a healthy economic climate, industrywide or in keeping with our national need.

Why is this so? Simply because of action by our own Government in the area of trade wherein imports of competitive fuels have destroyed the gains made by this industry. We have completely forgotten the basic principle so needed in a healthy economy.

We have forgotten job protection. It is unpopular today to talk protectionism and yet without job protection all else fades and soon we will be a Nation of workers half producing and half not producing.

2340

coast for the period April through November declined 4,442,000 barrels and the Bureau of Mines reports that refinery output of domestic residual on the eastern seaboard amounted to 31.7 million barrels April through October for 1962, the latest period available, as compared with 32 million in the same period of 1961. Thus, there was an actual decline of only about 4.5 million barrels in domestic supply in the first 8 months, compared to a year ago. This means that there was a net increase in residual available to the east coast of about 12.5 million barrels during the first 8 months of this quota year.

Even in the face of these facts, the Department of Interior is now adding an additional 6.5 million barrels during the next 60 days. Under the already existing import levels, quotas for this quarter were 37½ percent of the year's total, or 770,830 barrels per day. This enormous increase, when added to existing quotas, means that import levels for the next 2 months will reach the astronomical figure of 878,000 barrels per day.

This is by far the highest level of imports ever recorded under the oil import control program. The previous record was 819,000 barrels daily reached for 1 month in January of 1962.

This further severe blow to the domestic coal industry came despite the fact that the Department of Interior officials admit no shortage of residual oil now exists on the east coast. A survey made this week by NCPG among trade sources in New York-New England area revealed that residual imports are selling well below posted prices and that oil is in plentiful supply.

Yet, in face of adequate supplies and a stable price, the import quota for residual oil was again increased—the third such increase since this administration assumed office 2 years ago and raising imports to 190 million barrels for the year as compared to 154 million barrels of allowable imports in 1960.

There would seem to be no other conclusion to draw than that under this administration the domestic coal industry is considered expendable.

Frankly, I campaigned with confidence and so stated publicly that if elected, President Kennedy would help the coal regions. I still believe he is sincerely trying to do so.

I disagree with those Members of the administration who believe that relief, retraining, area development, public works or any other substitutes for a job can ever displace the need for the dignity that comes from a job that earns an honest living for an honest day's work.

The children of a working father, the wife of a working husband are entirely different people in the eyes of their loved ones, the eyes of their neighbors and in the community in which they live, than the employed, regardless of how worthy a cause his job was sacrificed to or for.

WELCOME PRESIDENT ROMULO BETANCOURT OF VENEZUELA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week President Kennedy told the Nation at his press conference:

I regard Latin America as the most critical area in the world today.

Certainly the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba is cause for grave concern. But the President, undoubtedly, also is preoccupied with the vast Latin American continent beyond the island of Cuba. Seething with social unrest and political instability, many of the Latin American Republics are prey to Communists subversion. Meanwhile, the Alliance for Progress has been disappointingly slow to alleviate those conditions which bar the great masses of Latin Americans from participation in the fruits of Western civilization.

Tomorrow Washington welcomes a gallant man from Venezuela, President Romulo Betancourt. President Betancourt has been fighting to bring to his nation the goals of the Alliance for Progress—social justice in a framework of political democracy.

In his struggle against tyranny Betancourt has known the terrors of the hunted man, separation from his loved ones, the bitterness of exile. As President of Venezuela, he has continued to endure great trials and personal sacrifice. All of us remember Trujillo's heinous attempt to assassinate him. Hardly a week goes by without a report of some effort to destroy confidence in Venezuela's democratic government. Sabotage of the oil wells, bombings of United States and Venezuelan business establishments, the theft of five art masterpieces, and that latest idiocy—the hijacking of a Venezuelan oil tanker on the high seas—all attest to the Castro-Communist determination to wreck democratic progress in Venezuela.

To Communist subversive activities are added constant efforts to discredit Betancourt on the part of the despots who formerly ran Venezuela as their personal fief. Unhappily, we have heard some of their propaganda repeated in this Chamber.

Fortunately, the free press in the United States reports the real state of affairs. I was particularly impressed by an editorial in this week's Life magazine, the issue of February 22. As Life says, Romulo Betancourt "is a most welcome guest." I include Life's perceptive editorial at this point in the RECORD:

This week Kennedy welcomes to Washington quite a different sort of Latin American from Fidel Castro. In fact he is Castro's number one target, the President of Venezuela, Romulo Betancourt. Five years ago in Venezuela the Vice President of the United States and his wife were spat on by an angry mob. The Communists who led that mob found plenty of readymade tinder, compounded of jealousy, neglect and hatred of the recent 10-year Pérez Jiménez dictatorship. Last week Venezuelan Communists were still trying to mobilize a following with acts of terrorism. But the masses no longer respond. Of many reasons for this important change, not the least is Betancourt.

Betancourt spent most of his early adult years in jail, exile or the underground while Venezuela was run by military dictators. He nevertheless helped to found the first

big modern political party in Venezuela, the Accion Democratica, whose peasants and workers made Betancourt president in the free election of 1958. Since then he has given Venezuela the longest and most successful constitutional government in its 142-year-old history. A year hence he has a good chance to fulfill his great ambition of turning over his office to a freely elected successor who can consolidate Venezuela's fledgling democracy.

Like other Latin American countries, Venezuela still has problems of poverty and ignorance. Unlike most, being the world's No. 1 oil exporter, Venezuela has the money to tackle them. But only since Betancourt has it shown the political guts and imagination to try. His government has approximately doubled the number of schools and students in 5 years, and raised the literacy rate around 50 to over 70 percent. It has tried seriously to improve the lot of the campesinos with free land, better housing, loans and instructions. And it has helped the underprivileged without alienating the rapidly expanding business class or the still-potent army. Betancourt's stand against Castrolism has been so courageous that the danger of a military coup, despite Communist provocation, grows smaller by the day. One of South America's most volatile countries has proved that democracy, given a chance, can be made to work.

That, of course, is the whole aim of the Alliance for Progress. The reason it is in trouble, according to one expert group, is that it has "lapsed into a unilateral U.S. checkwriting program." But Venezuelan leaders take its two-way nature seriously. They get some \$100 million in Alliance loans for housing and rural improvement, but their own much larger contribution and initiative are what gives these programs life. Once considered the backwash of Spanish America, Venezuela is discovering it has many assets that can enable it to outgrow its dependence on oil, not least a mixed and lively population relatively unencumbered by feudal tradition. It also has Romulo Betancourt. As representative of a continent in which hope, progress and U.S. policy are very much in doubt, he is a most welcome guest.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the welcome to President Betancourt, a courageous leader in the struggle for democracy. I am confident that even in his brief visit with us he will detect the great admiration of the American people for his contribution to the cause of freedom and democracy.

U.N. AGRICULTURAL AID TO CUBA

(Mr. RUMSFELD (at the request of Mr. BRUCE) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement that the United Nations has decided to grant agricultural aid to the Castro regime is unbelievable. Equally shocking is the statement of Paul G. Hoffman, Managing Director for the United Nations Special Fund which will supply the \$1,500,000 of aid, where he says that not one American dollar will be used in this project. It is simply not correct to suggest that U.S. dollars will not be used when it is common knowledge that the United States provides 40 percent of the Special Fund's expenses. The American people will not and should not accept this double talk. The United States is paying for a major portion of the support of the United Nations. The

I say this knowing full well, the implications of my remarks. When we consider industrial and agricultural producers as against those whose incomes in whole or in part are dependent upon the services rendered to the production workers or upon public taxes, the load carried by the production dollar becomes very heavy.

No nation can survive in an atmosphere of unrealistic theory and public policy. The Nation's oftentimes repeated policy is to make all other nations self-dependent and yet at the same time we follow a course destroying our own self-dependency.

Even today unless we can keep the trade lines open it will be next to impossible to gear up, tool up, and produce for a major war of any duration.

We have lost supremacy in so many fields of production that it is becoming a serious problem just to hold on as an industrial complex in a world fast becoming a massive automated machine shop.

Sooner or later the nations whose economies are based upon selling to the U.S. market will find the well has gone dry and eventually will have to turn to their own markets for a sustaining economy.

We cannot buy all the world's production but we are trying like heck to do it.

We not only offer to go into the trading with the Common Market but in the same breath—Trade Expansion Act—we take on all comers.

When you consider our domestic costs of production, based upon mandated, fixed costs for power and services, labor and taxes, plus raw materials, it is like a free-for-all with the United States represented by a blindfolded lightweight with one hand strapped behind his back in a ring with each GATT nation and every underdeveloped nation represented by heavyweights two hands free and no blindfolds.

If you think this is far fetched read the reports of the hearing on the impact of imports, count the industries affected, evaluate the man-hours and wages lost by imports as against gains from exports and then tell me if you still think I am wrong.

No nation can survive in a free-for-all trade war unless it can produce with slave or near slave labor, low or no taxes, subsidy or tax credits.

In the end it will wind up in international bankruptcy, and whether we like it or not, de Gaulle's position is giving many U.S. workers a reprieve from the unemployment lines.

The trouble is that while all our front runners are screaming about de Gaulle's grand design they forget that we have a grand design of our own which includes such catchy words as "EurAmerica," "Atlantic Union," "GATT," "oil imports," and so forth.

One wonders whether we are not in about the same fix as the kid caught with his hand in the cookie jar.

I refuse to believe as of today that the President of the United States will ignore or set aside without consideration this plea of 102 Members of the House in this serious matter posed by the McDermott division.

I received the following correspondence which I believe to be of interest to all Members of the House:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 14, 1963.

HON. JOHN H. DENT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your concern, along with that of 101 of your colleagues, regarding excessive importation of foreign residual oil, and the need to maintain reasonable import controls on such oil, was clearly shown by your signing the letter to the President of February 7, 1963.

In spite of your recommendation, the Office of Emergency Planning recommended to the President on February 13, 1963, the further relaxing of all controls on foreign residual oil. The report also declared that the Nation did not need to depend on natural resources within its own borders for its security, thus implying that import limits on crude oil also are unnecessary.

We have sent you a copy of our statement expressing consternation over this action.

A statement by you on this matter is urgent to give the President your opinion on these recommendations. We are also hopeful you will feel it proper to express your views on the floor of the House when it reconvenes Monday. This is a critical emergency for all domestic fuels.

JOSEPH E. MOODY,
President.

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 13.—President Joseph E. Moody, of National Coal Policy Conference today issued the following statement:

"The recommendations of the Office of Emergency Planning Director Edward McDermott, if accepted by the President, will constitute the most serious blow that this administration has so far dealt the men and their families of the coal and related industries. The interest of hundreds of thousands of American citizens were brushed callously aside for purposes of political expediency.

"It is difficult to reconcile this report with the repeated statements of the President expressing his concern for the domestic fuel industries, especially coal. If these recommendations are carried out it can mean disaster in the economies of West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois and other States.

"It is our understanding that the report is the same except for some word changes as it was in September 1962. It recommends that the import program on residual oil be gradually abandoned and further serves notice the same is in store for the rest of the import program on crude oil and other products.

"In that the report has been in the making since May 1961 and the present form reportedly has been available since last September, the coincidence of the visit next week of Mr. Betancourt, President of Venezuela, can hardly be ignored.

"The threat of 'Castrolism' hanging over one Latin American country, and the recurrent riots by the Communist elements there seem able to panic the U.S. Government while it remains unconcerned about the critical plight of its own citizens.

"The report reaches the strange conclusion that 'The adequacy of resources is not strictly a national problem—is not one for which one looks for an answer within the geographical limits of the United States.'

"This means that, in the opinion of the OEP Director, America need no longer be concerned with developing and strengthening its own resources, and can only be interpreted as meaning that import restrictions on crude oil are also considered unnecessary.

"If this revolutionary thinking is accepted by the President, the ultimate end can only

mean far greater damage to both the American coal and petroleum industries. Dependence of our economy, as well as our national security, on the tenuous availability of fuel from foreign countries, in view of the current situation in the Caribbean, with Russia tightening its military hold on Cuba and Venezuela constantly threatened by Communist riots and unrest, could be disastrous.

"The domestic fuels industries have kept the Congress advised over the years and there have been many of the members of Congress who have expressed deep concern that the welfare of the domestic fuels industries was important to the strength of the economy of this Nation. As has been so often true in the history of this Nation, matters of this nature of such vital concern to so great a part of the American people, may have to be finally settled by the Congress.

"The conclusions of the OEP Director are completely contrary to findings by the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives which held extensive hearings on the question of oil imports and recommended just last month that 'the import quotas of residual fuel oil to be used solely as fuel should be fixed at a level no higher than the total of such imports in 1961, so as to reduce the threat to national security which residual oil imports now create.'

"It should be recalled that this conclusion was reached by the Small Business Committee following extensive hearings by a subcommittee headed by Representative Tom STEED, of Oklahoma."

Mr. Speaker, the recommendation of the OEC Director on top of the unwarranted increase in residual oil import quotas for the remainder of this quarter announced recently represents another severe blow to the already seriously damaged coal industry.

The total increase—17,000 barrels per day, for the full year to be available in the next 2 months—is more than 6.5 million barrels, or the equivalent of 1.5 million additional tons of coal to be displaced in the next 2 months.

"This lost coal production would have provided jobs for more than 600 U.S. coal miners for a full year, or 3,600 miners during the next 2 months," Mr. Moody said. "These destroyed miners' jobs can now be added to the 17,000 full-time jobs already lost each year to imported residual oil, which now displaces more than 45 million tons of U.S. coal annually.

Today's action was taken at the same time that a spokesman for the administration acknowledged to us that there has been an increase in imports in the first 8 months of the quota year of over 17 million barrels and that consumption on the east coast has been 5.6 million barrels less than was anticipated by the Bureau of Mines in their demand forecast on which quotas were established last April.

The Department of Interior press release announcing the new increase stated that there was a reduction of 4 million barrels in stocks as of December 31, and that the supply of domestic residual for the east coast this year had proved to be approximately 10 million barrels less than was anticipated by the Bureau of Mines.

However, the Geological Survey, which compiles such figures for the Department of Interior, reports that shipments of domestic residual from the gulf

United States will be making a contribution to this project whether direct or indirect, and this is intolerable.

To grant any amount of aid to the Communist nation that has confiscated more than \$1 billion worth of American property and has not paid a cent in compensation is utterly unthinkable.

Mr. Speaker, while the subject of Cuba is under discussion, I wish to go on record as being in complete disagreement with the theory now apparently in vogue in administration circles that no one but the administration should discuss Cuba. In these days of managed news, I sincerely believe that it is the responsibility and duty of each citizen, and, particularly, each Member of Congress, to constructively discuss and, if necessary, as in this case, dare to criticize the decisions being made and carried out in our State Department by the administration. These men are not omniscient; their decisions are not sacrosanct.

This Nation is one of representative government, and as one Representative, I object to our financing anti-American policies. If this means that the Congress must cut off support for the Special Fund, then this must be done.

I have voiced my support of the United Nations in the past, as have the vast majority of Americans. However, this U.N. action demands a serious reappraisal of our role in the U.N. My deep concern has been voiced to the administration, and I sincerely hope that other Members of Congress will join in expressing their disapproval. Cuba today is a center for Communist subversive activities throughout the Western Hemisphere. Our every action must be to weaken communism in Cuba, not strengthen it.

A REAPPRAISAL OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. BRUCE) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the future of the Alliance for Progress. So far there has been very little progress, and too little leadership from the United States. The program cannot be allowed to continue to flounder. The future of the Western Hemisphere is at stake.

I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a memorandum prepared by three members of the Commerce Committee for the Alliance for Progress—COMAP: Emilio G. Collado, vice president and director, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; David Rockefeller, president, the Chase Manhattan Bank; and Walter B. Wriston, executive vice president, First National City Bank.

The authors call for a comprehensive reappraisal of the policies and actions that will help the Alliance for Progress to achieve its basic objectives. They urge that increased emphasis be placed on the "encouragement of private initiative and investment, both local and foreign." It is their further belief that:

The United States should concentrate its economic aid program in countries that show

the greatest inclination to adopt measures to improve the investment climate and withhold aid from others until satisfactory performance has been demonstrated.

This is an important study and I hope that it receives the widest possible attention.

The text of the statement follows:

A REAPPRAISAL OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS
Last spring, the Commerce Committee for the Alliance for Progress (COMAP) was launched with a view to seeking ways in which American business could further the Alliance. A few days ago, the Chairman of the Committee—J. Peter Grace—submitted a report to the Commerce Department and to other agencies, recommending certain legislative proposals relating to the Alliance. The following memorandum sets out the observations and conclusions of three members of COMAP who, while agreeing with many of the points made in the Grace report feel that there are certain aspects of the problem which need a somewhat different emphasis. For this reason we feel justified in submitting a separate commentary.

"We have become increasingly concerned lest the Alliance for Progress fail to achieve its objectives for lack of a proper focus for its activities.

"As one illustration, the initial concept of COMAP's role appears to have been directed at finding ways to meet the Punta del Este program of \$300 million a year of net new U.S. private investment in Latin America by devising short-range measures on the part of the United States to encourage such investment. If such measures would really get the Alliance off the ground, they might be justified. But we are disturbed by the feeling that even if such measures were taken, and were successful in inducing an expanded flow of U.S. investments into Latin America, the basic problem of making the area attractive to local savers and investors would remain. Indeed, such a program could do positive harm by making local governments feel even less urgency than they do now for achieving a proper investment climate.

"What is needed is a comprehensive reappraisal, not of the broad objectives of the Alliance for Progress, but of the policies and actions which will best achieve these objectives. The first year's operation of the Alliance saw heavy emphasis placed on government planning, government-to-government loans and grants, income redistribution through tax and land reform, public housing, and other social welfare measures. Many of these steps were commendable. Yet they were not in most cases accompanied by efforts to push through economic reforms which would encourage private initiative and enterprise. The continued outflow of private funds from Latin America is sufficient proof of the critical character of the current situation.

"Many countries in Latin America need social reforms as well as measures to provide greater equality of opportunity. However, these broad objectives cannot be achieved without a more rapid rate of economic advance than now is in prospect. And rapid economic growth cannot be achieved without greater emphasis on the private sector. The fact is that some 80 percent of Latin America's national income is today generated by private activities. Consequently, the Alliance for Progress can succeed if—and only if—it builds upon this base and places far greater emphasis on the encouragement of private initiative and investment, both local and foreign.

"To reorient the Alliance for Progress in a direction which offers promise of achieving its objectives involves difficult and sweeping economic reforms. Currencies need to be stabilized through measures to bring government budgets under control and to avoid in-

flationary increases in the supply of money and credit. Efforts along these lines could lead to the removal of the many exchange controls which still remain and which inhibit economic growth in many nations. At the same time, governments should act to remove the network of other controls which restrict enterprise and sustain local, high-cost monopolies. Economic growth, and the real benefits to all participants in the community which can accrue from growth, are maximized in an atmosphere of political and economic stability under which competitive private enterprise can thrive.

"In a very real sense, the Alliance for Progress is concerned with the age-old problem of trying to bake a bigger pie and divide the slices more evenly at the same time. The emphasis to date has been mostly on the side of slicing the pie. While such efforts may be desirable in the long run, the immediate effect has been to shrink the potential size of the pie. Experience around the world shows clearly that the national welfare is better served by far through policies which enlarge the entire pie.

"To accelerate economic advance in Latin America, efforts on many fronts will be required. Governments have important roles to play—in such areas as schools, health, farm extension services and roads. However, the overriding needs is for an increased flow of private capital from both local and foreign sources and for a significant and continuing improvement in the efficiency with which all resources, including most importantly human resources, are used.

"For these reasons, we urge that U.S. policies be reoriented to place far greater emphasis on the encouragement of private enterprise and investment. What has been done to date along these lines is simply not enough. The encouragement of private enterprise, local and foreign, must become the main thrust of the Alliance. This would involve two major changes in U.S. policy.

"The first requirement is that the governments—and, as far as possible, the people—of Latin America know that the United States has changed its policy so as to put primary stress on improvement in the general business climate as a prerequisite for social development and reform. It must be made clear that U.S. policy in this hemisphere is based on the need for rapid economic growth and on the belief, confirmed by all available evidence, that this can be achieved within a reasonably free political framework only if private capital is given the opportunity to work in a favorable environment. This means that our policies should be consistent throughout the area and should discourage tendencies toward nationalization of industries and encourage setting up explicit rules which provide for truly reasonable indemnification where nationalization has taken place.

"In addition we should discourage policies which tend to distort normal economic relationships—policies leading to overvalued, and multivalued exchange systems, complex import controls with high and highly variable tariffs, quotas and other forms of trade restriction, price controls and highly unpredictable budgetary practice. In short, emphasis should be placed on creating an atmosphere in which private business planning can go on without undue concern about possible changes in the rules of the game. Countries following these policies should be given tangible and active support.

"To make this position clear and unambiguous, it would be necessary for the President to proclaim it in a major address in which he not only spells out the rationale behind the new policy, but also indicates the tools available to the United States to help make it effective. The most important of these tools would be the U.S. foreign aid program.

"A second requirement concerns a change in the criteria for granting aid. U.S. foreign aid policy is a branch of U.S. foreign policy, which should be directed toward achieving specific foreign policy goals. By and large it has not been effectively used for this purpose in Latin America. In its simplest terms, our goal in Latin America should be to help nations of the area grow economically while they retain internal political freedom, and thus remain part of the Western community of nations. Without economic growth the other goals will be much more difficult—if not impossible—to achieve. In order to get growth—which comes first both in time and in relation to goals involving redistribution of income—capital is needed. Most of this must come from internal sources. Thus, foreign aid should be used as an inducement to nations to adopt policies which will improve the business climate and thereby increase domestic savings and investments. The United States should concentrate its economic aid program in countries that show the greatest inclination to adopt measures to improve the investment climate, and withhold aid from others until satisfactory performance has been demonstrated.

"The extent to which this policy would differ from the present one in Latin America can be seen by indicating what it would not involve:

"1. Unless there are overpowering political considerations, the United States would not lend money or make grants in countries which persist in policies which discourage private investment.

"2. The United States would not grant balance-of-payments loans of the bail-out variety though it should cooperate with the IMF on constructive balance-of-payments loans and stabilization programs.

"3. The United States would not provide foreign aid in such a way as to finance the expropriation of privately owned companies in any field of endeavor.

"On the positive side, the United States would seek opportunities to get individual countries started toward rapid growth. Assistance on a relatively large scale would be focused in a few countries that appeared most likely to carry out measures needed to encourage investments and establish the widest area of economic freedom.

"Nowhere in the whole broad range of current economic problems is there one more compellingly significant for the United States than that of supporting the economic and social advance of our neighbors to the South.

"We are persuaded that the most important way in which the United States can help is by exporting the ideas implicit in a free economy. Certainly, money or goods alone will not do the job. Free enterprise is the basis of our own growth, and it provided the framework on which our social and political institutions, imperfect as they still are, have evolved. We feel certain that free enterprise can be the basis of growth in Latin America—indeed, that there is no known alternative that still permits a substantial measure of individual freedom.

"We also believe, however, that to encourage such an evolution in Latin America the United States must change its role—from one that emphasizes short run economic palliatives combined with recommendations for sweeping social and economic reforms to one that places the greatest emphasis on the longer-run goals of creating an environment in which freedom of the

marketplace is recognized for what it is, a major pillar of free and prosperous societies.

"EMILIO G. COLLADO,
"Vice President and Director,
"Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.
"DAVID ROCKEFELLER,
"President,
"The Chase Manhattan Bank.
"WALTER B. WRISTON,
"Executive Vice President,
"First National City Bank."

THE CUBAN QUESTION

(MR. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. BRUCE) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, because of its importance I am today placing in the Record a column by Walter Lippmann entitled "On the Cuban Question Today." In the column Mr. Lippmann puts down his reasons for believing that our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New York, Senator KEATING, has won the right to be listened to. Mr. Lippmann states in his article that after too long a delay the administration finally did what it should have done in the beginning, which was to arrange for consultation and an exchange of information between Senator KEATING and the CIA. Mr. Lippmann goes on and states that no matter what the consultation and exchange lead to he is not sure it will repair altogether the damage done to public confidence by the misleading information given out—the administration—in September and October.

The administration may well have also to make a full explanation of what went wrong in September and early October—

States Mr. Lippmann.

Mr. Lippmann's article is timely and I commend it to the attention of the Members of the House and Senate:

ON THE CUBAN QUESTION TODAY (By Walter Lippmann)

In the past week the administration has gone to extraordinary lengths to win the country's confidence in the reliability of its information about the military situation in Cuba. Since the October confrontation there can, of course, be no lack of confidence in the President's courage and determination to protect American interests once the facts of a threat are established.

The crisis of confidence originates in what happened in the 6 weeks before the October confrontation. During the month of September and into October the administration was insisting that the Soviet Union had not brought offensive weapons into Cuba. Senator KEATING was insisting that they had. When he was found to have been right, there occurred a loss of confidence in the administration's intelligence services which it is still struggling to repair.

With others, I have had firsthand experience which enables me to understand how difficult it is to restore confidence once it has been shaken. On two occasions it was explained to me by high officials how reliable was our photographic surveillance of the island, and how certainly we could detect the exact nature of the weapons being

installed in Cuba. These private explanations came after the President had said categorically in his press conference of September 13 that "these new shipments do not constitute a serious threat to any other part of the hemisphere." Some 2 weeks later, on October 3, the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Ball, gave to a congressional committee a summary of the intelligence information which came from the CIA. The point of the summary was that there were no offensive weapons in Cuba.

But in fact there were. A week later, on October 10, Senator KEATING insisted that there were intermediate range missiles in Cuba, and 5 days later the President received the photographs which confirmed the charge.

This is how Senator KEATING won the right to be listened to, and this is why the administration has now, belatedly, made the right move, which is to arrange for consultation and an exchange of information between Senator KEATING and the CIA.

This should put an end to the unseemly controversy about who is telling the truth between a Senator of the United States and the President of the United States. But I am not sure it will repair altogether the damage done to public confidence by the misleading information given out in September and October. The administration may well have also to make a full explanation of what went wrong in September and early October.

Examining the remarkable intelligence briefing by Mr. John Hughes of the Defense Department, I find myself quite convinced that our photographic intelligence is now reliable. But I am struck by the fact that there was a blank space in Mr. Hughes' testimony for the period from September 5 to October 14.

Photographs taken on August 29 of the San Cristobal area and on September 5 at Sagua la Grande show positively that no missile sites had been built. The next photograph referred to by Mr. Hughes is that of October 14. It shows intermediate range missile sites being erected. This is the photograph which precipitated the international crisis.

Where, we are bound to ask, was our photographic intelligence between September 5 and October 14? That was when the administration was telling the country that there were no offensive weapons in Cuba. This is the source of the infection which will have to be removed if full confidence is to be restored.

Having said this, I would say that there is no reason to doubt the thoroughness or the reliability of our photographic surveillance of Cuba and of the sea around it. The situation is extraordinary. We are depending on being able to fly daily photographic reconnaissance planes at high and low altitude. In Cuba there are a large number of the latest antiaircraft weapons manned by Soviet soldiers.

We may say, how come? Up to the present—knock on wood—the Soviet antiaircraft gunners are not attacking our reconnaissance planes. They must be under orders from Moscow where it is well known that if the planes were attacked there would be an immediate reprisal.

But where does this leave us? It leaves us with a fragile revised version of the original Khrushchev-Kennedy agreement. In the key letter of October 27, President Kennedy accepted the following terms of settlement: The U.S.S.R. would remove offensive weapon systems under United Nations observation and supervision. When this was done, the United States would end the quarantine and

would give assurances against an invasion of Cuba. The USSR removed the missiles, and the United States of America ended the quarantine. But Castro would not permit United Nations observers to come to Cuba, and consequently the United States would give no assurances against invasion.

What we have now is a substitute for the original agreement. We are able to carry on photographic reconnaissance without interference from the Soviet anti-aircraft weapons. And Cuba is getting, in lieu of a U.S. guarantee against invasion, a buildup of its defensive capabilities. Both Moscow and Washington know that this strange working arrangement cannot be upset deliberately without bringing on a much mightier confrontation than that of last October.

CLOSE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPRESENTATIVES AND PUBLISHERS OF WEEKLY PAPERS

(Mr. HARDING (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, one of the privileges of serving a congressional district in the Nation's Capital is the close relationship that a Congressman has with the publishers of weekly papers in his district.

During the past couple of years I have come to know and to admire the publisher of a small newspaper in Shoshone, Idaho—Herb Love.

This man can best be described by the inscription on a plaque recently presented to him by the Idaho Press Association which bestowed upon him the Master Editor-Publisher Award which is the highest honor the weekly press can bestow upon one of its members.

The inscription reads:

He has worked hard, lived honestly, thought soundly, influenced wisely, and is entitled to the highest honor in his profession.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point in the Record the account of the awarding of this honor to Herb Love as it is reported in the Lincoln County Journal of January 17, 1963.

This excellent county paper is now being published by a young and energetic newspaperman, John George, who gives every indication of also becoming one of Idaho's outstanding weekly publishers.

The above-mentioned follows:

IDAHO'S HIGHEST JOURNALISM HONOR AWARDED TO EDITOR FROM SHOSHONE

The highest honor that the Idaho Press Association can bestow on one of its members, the Master Editor-Publisher Award, was presented to Herb. H. Love, Saturday night. The award crowns a journalistic career of 23 years.

Editors and publishers throughout Idaho, assembled at Hotel Boise for a banquet at the conclusion of their annual meeting, vigorously applauded their approval when the name of the winner was announced.

The honor is one that is not lightly given. Winners are determined by a selection committee of Idaho editors and publishers.

The inscription on the plaque presented Mr. Love sums up the devotion and talent he has given to journalism in these words: "He has worked hard, lived honorably, thought soundly, influenced unselfishly, and

is entitled to the highest honor in his profession."

Lincoln County may well be proud of the man who has served them so well for the past 19 years.

Mr. Love was born in South Dakota and reared in Iowa. He attended Iowa State Teachers College and Iowa State College, earning his bachelor of arts degree from the teachers college in 1924. During World War I he served in the U.S. Navy.

The new master editor-publisher came to Idaho in 1925 to serve as superintendent of schools at Fairfield, a post he held for 2 years. He coached athletics at Hailey for a year, and was an instructor in the Wendell school for 2 years before leaving the teaching profession because of physical disability.

He married Helen Shuey of Wendell at Richfield in 1929. The couple have two children, a son, John, employed by Ball Products Co. of Boulder, Colo., and a daughter, Mrs. Judith Abraham, a student at Kansas City Art Institute.

From 1933 to 1944 Mr. Love was assessor of Gooding County, resigning in his sixth term to assume ownership of the Lincoln County Journal.

He founded the Gooding Independent in 1936 and owned the paper until 1940, at which time it was sold and merged with the Gooding Leader. He is a charter member of the Gooding Lions Club and served as its president just before coming to Shoshone.

Mr. Love was commander of the Shoshone American Legion Post in 1949, and was elected district commander in 1950. He is also a past president of the Shoshone Chamber of Commerce and the Shoshone Rotary Club. From 1955 to 1959 he served on the Shoshone City Council.

Mr. Love purchased the Journal from Glen Maxwell in May of 1944 and operated the paper for almost 19 years.

He was president of the Idaho Press Association in 1948, and was a director of the Idaho Newspaper Advertising Service for two terms before being elected president of that organization.

Mr. and Mrs. Love will remain in Shoshone, but plan an extended trip through Colorado, Texas, and Florida this winter.

GENERAL EXCELLENCE

The Lincoln County Journal was awarded first place for general excellence in its circulation bracket at the press association's annual convention in Boise last weekend. The Journal has now won the top award for 4 years in succession.

Contest judges were publishers and press association managers in Arizona, Montana, Nevada, and Washington.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

(Mr. ST. GERMAIN (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the measure I am introducing today, a bill to establish a land and water conservation fund, embodies the administration's program to further provide for the outdoor recreation needs of the Nation.

In his conservation message last year, President Kennedy warned that our present sources of recreation are not adequate to meet current demands. It is his view and mine that we must take positive action now, for as he wisely points out, "actions deferred are all too

often opportunities lost, particularly in safeguarding our natural resources."

The legislation I am presenting today is a far-reaching proposal which provides for today's recreation needs while anticipating those of the near future. While the bill is fundamentally the same as the one submitted last year, the new version authorizes a program for 50 percent matching grants to the States for planning, and 30-percent grants for acquisition and development of needed outdoor recreation resources. The States will share the funds available in the following manner: one-fifth divided equally, three-fifths apportioned on the basis of population, and one-fifth allocated according to need.

In order for a State to qualify for assistance, it must have a comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan, and the States are eligible to receive assistance in the preparation of such a plan and for the training of necessary personnel. Also, in anticipation of escalating prices for the future acquisition of land for recreational purposes, the bill limits expenditures for State development work for the next 10 years to 10 percent of the funds available for State assistance. The funds provided by this bill will also be available for acquisition of land and water which is authorized for areas of the national park system and areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior for outdoor recreation purposes; the national forest system; purposes of national areas for the preservation of species of fish or wildlife threatened with extinction; and incidental recreation purposes in connection with national fish and wildlife conservation areas as authorized by law.

Revenue sources provided by the bill include proceeds from entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees or charges established by the President for Federal land and water areas; proceeds from the sale of Federal surplus real property; and the proceeds of the 4-cent-per-gallon tax on gasoline and special motor fuels used in motorboats. While the Treasury will hold a portion of these revenues for acquisition of additional lands at Federal and federally assisted projects, the greater portion would be used to help finance State and Federal programs.

For the purpose of assuring the financing of the program when the States are prepared for full participation, advance appropriations of \$60 million a year for 8 years are authorized beginning with the third year, with provision for repayment from one-half of the revenues available to the fund. The fund will be used in the proportion of 60 percent for State purposes and 40 percent either way depending on need.

This measure is in complete accord with the recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. It is fiscally sound and forward looking. I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that it will receive favorable action at this session of Congress and that the country will be able to realize its benefits in the near future.

THE LATE HONORABLE ROBERT RICE REYNOLDS

Mr. TAYLOR (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, citizens of North Carolina and people across the Nation were saddened last Wednesday by the death of former U.S. Senator Robert Rice Reynolds at his home in Asheville, N.C.

Mr. Reynolds represented North Carolina in the U.S. Senate from 1933 until his retirement from the Senate in 1945. He ranks among the most colorful and controversial figures in American political history. He stormed Washington with a grandeur perhaps never to be duplicated. He was different and glamorous and those about him quickly realized it.

Perhaps no other U.S. Senator brought to Washington such a wide variety of experience as did Robert R. Reynolds. He had been a professional wrestler, a football coach, a war correspondent, an author, an actor, a motion-picture producer, and a criminal lawyer. He loved outdoor life and his earliest political campaigns were conducted traveling by horse in the North Carolina mountains.

His appearance in the Nation's Capital followed his famous campaign of 1932 which he launched with \$20 and a T-model Ford purchased on the installment plan. His majority in the election was one of the largest in North Carolina's history. He arrived in Washington in his "rusty and trusty" Ford and showed no hesitation in driving it to White House teas and other black tie occasions.

When he returned to North Carolina he stated that he had taken his faithful Ford to the Capital and parked it between two Cadillacs in a million-dollar garage which Mr. Hoover had built and that it rolled its mud-splattered eyes around and looked up at him and said: "Bob, ain't we in society now?"

Bob Reynolds' stories, similar to the one above, are told all over North Carolina. They are told here in Washington. He will be remembered as a legendary son of the Blue Ridge Mountains.

Affectionately known as "Our Bob" by friends back home and sometimes referred to as "Buncombe Bob," Senator Reynolds was the founder of the American Nationalist Party in 1941 and rose to the chairmanship of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

A great deal more could be said about the accomplishments and activities and controversies of Senator Reynolds as a Member of Congress, but I wish to touch briefly on the human qualities of this foremost American citizen.

He was sincerely concerned for the people he represented. His personality was magnetic; his charm, warm and abiding. Perhaps his greatest attribute, however, was that he never forgot his friends.

His rich personality, keen sense of humor, and loyalty to his friends endeared him to the people of North Carolina.

Bob Reynolds loved life and he lived it fully.

PANAMA CANAL PROCRASTINATION PERILOUS

(Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it has been aptly stated that the history of the Panama Canal is one of continuing crises. Those of key character concern the best site and the best type, known as the battle of routes and battle of the levels. Moreover, this pattern of struggle reappears periodically, and since 1947 the question of the proper modernization of the Panama Canal has been beset with repetitions of these old controversies in slightly modified forms.

Over a period of years, a number of Members of the Congress, several in the House but only one in the Senate, who have made serious studies of the canal question and recognized its magnitude, have introduced bills to create the Inter-oceanic Canals Commission. In so doing, it was their purpose to provide an effective agency to develop a timely, definite, and wisely reasoned Isthmian canal policy, which the Congress and the Nation can accept and which time and usage will justify.

Unfortunately, this task has been complicated immeasurably by the ratification in 1955 of a secretly contrived canal treaty between the United States and Panama and by the nationalization in 1956 of the Suez Canal by Egypt. Despite the inherent differences between the juridical foundations of the two inter-oceanic canals, this action by Egypt served to evoke a chain of aggressive nationalistic and communistic revolutionary inspired agitations in Panama, some of them marked by mob violence led by well-trained leaders. The long-range objectives of this revolutionary movement is the wresting of the sovereign control of the Panama Canal from the United States and the extortion of greater benefits from the toll revenues. The only basis for such aims is that inherent in Panama's geographical location, which is adjacent to the Canal Zone territory. The difficulties of securing increased transit capacity have now become severely aggravated by the necessity for safeguarding the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the United States over the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone.

As a start in this direction, I made a series of major addresses in the House beginning in 1957 and continuing up to the present Congress. These included, in comprehensive detail, the diplomatic and legislative history of the acquisition by the United States in 1904 of our territorial possession known as the Panama Canal Zone.

Though these efforts were generally ignored in the mass news media of the United States or, when presented, had their meaning distorted, they were prominently featured in the press of Panama, especially in the Spanish language papers, which I follow closely. Through the latter, they have produced echoes from various countries of Latin America.

The failure on the part of elements in our Department of State to stop the depredations of isthmian agitators by means of forthright declarations of U.S. policy, in the course of time, has led to a chain of diplomatic victories by Panama, making the United States a laughing stock in the Western Hemisphere. So confident did anti-U.S. extremists become that the Panamanian National Assembly even attempted to encircle the Canal Zone by enacting legislation extending the 3-mile limit to 12 miles, with Panama controlling the water at each end of the zone's 3-mile limit, which could have made that waterway another Berlin. This attempt, our Government very promptly and properly refused to recognize, but friction resulted.

The radical leadership in the Panama National Assembly, which includes some Marxist-Leninists, obviously understood the significance of my researches in the exposure of their schemes and did not stop with the attempted encirclement of the Canal Zone. It followed up by giving me the unique distinction of being formally declared as public enemy No. 1 of Panama.

The situation on the isthmus was worsened on September 17, 1960, when the President of the United States, in a mistaken gesture of friendship, by an Executive order soon after the adjournment of the Congress, directed the formal display of the Panamanian flag outside the flag of the United States at one place in the Canal Zone as evidence of a so-called titular sovereignty of Panama over the zone. This unfortunate precedent of striking the American flag in the Canal Zone, as predicted by me on the floor of the House, merely served to open the door, for in Panama and elsewhere, the action was interpreted as a belated United States recognition of Panamanian sovereignty.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would invite attention to the fact that on February 2, 1960, after full debate, the House of Representatives approved House Concurrent Resolution 459, 86th Congress, against such display by the overwhelming vote of 381 to 12, which was transmitted to the Senate but, for reasons not published, was never acted upon by that body. In addition, the Congress passed the Gross amendment to the Department of Commerce Appropriations Act prohibiting the expenditure of funds embraced in the act for such purpose. No wonder Isthmian extremists became emboldened and arrogant.

Under these circumstances, the necessity for an effective counterpoise to Panama became clearly evident. This compensating force developed in the form of growing demands for a second canal at Nicaragua, the ancient rival of the Panamanian site, and elsewhere. In an address to the House on June 30, 1960, I undertook to give a comprehensive description of the Nicaraguan project, which was largely based on a 1931 report—House Document No. 139, 72d Congress—and to advocate its consideration. The second canal idea, thus stimulated, served as an antidote for Castroism in Panama and to still some of the violent

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD INDEX

- COOPER, JOHN SHERMAN—Continued
Statement: House Action on Supplemental Appropriation Bill, by Senator Javits, 22192.
- Bills and joint resolutions introduced by*
Small Business Investment Act Amendments of 1962: enact (see bill S. 3737), 20247.
Small business investment companies: relating to tax treatment of (see bill S. 3736), 20247.
- Motions and resolutions offered by*
Mississippi: support efforts of President to enforce compliance with Federal court mandates in (see S. Con. Res. 96), 20038.
- Remarks by, on*
Federal-Aid Highway Act: bill (H.R. 12135) authorizing appropriations, 21017.
Foreign aid: bill (H.R. 13175) making appropriations, 20404, 20405.
Kwauk, Molly: bill (H.R. 9669) for relief of, 21937, 21938.
McMurrin, Sterling: tribute, 20495.
Public works: bill (H.R. 12900) making appropriations, 22170.
Reserve Officers Association: 40th anniversary, 20510.
Rivers and harbors and flood control projects: bill (S. 3773; H.R. 13273) authorizing, 20994, 22172, 22173.
- COOPER BROS. INC., letter, SBA loan, 21114.
- COPYRIGHT LAWS.**
Remarks in House
Government employees: writings, 21469.
Government publications: copyrighting, 21469.
- COPYRIGHTS.**
Articles and editorials
Astronauts and Copyrights, A7590.
Governmental Copyrights (sundry), A7611, A7612, A7590.
- Bills and resolutions*
Investigate (see H. Res. 829).
- COQUILLE (OREG.) VALLEY SENTINEL, article, Donald Crockett, 20330.
- CORBETT, ROBERT J. (a Representative from Pennsylvania).
Appointed conferee, 20372, 21143.
- Remarks by, on*
Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act: bill (H.R. 7927) to enact, 21404, 21405.
- CORBIN, H. DAN, letter, American sports, 21323.
- CORKBOARD. See TARIFF Act of 1930.
- CORMAN, JAMES C. (a Representative from California).
Appointed on funeral committee, 21643.
- Remarks by, on*
Children employed on farms: bill (S. 1123) to extend child labor provisions of Fair Labor Standards Act to, 21174.
Miles, Clem: eulogy, 21635.
- CORPORATIONS, address, Big Business, Big Unions, Big Government, Representative Celler, A7411.
Article: U.S. Business Spending More Abroad Than at Home, 21860.
Table: Investments abroad, 21860.
Remarks in House: Investments abroad, 21860.
- COSTANZO, JOSEPH F., sermon, Civic Corporate Prayer in Public Schools, A7592.
- COST OF LIVING. See INFLATION.
- COTTER, CARL H., remarks in Senate, relief, 21562.
- COTTON. See AGRICULTURE.
- COTTON, NORRIS (a Senator from New Hampshire).
Remarks by, on
Butler, John Marshall: tribute, 20322.
- COUNCIL BLUFFS (IOWA) NONPAREIL, article, How To Save \$50 Billion Taxes in Next 20 Years, A7217.
- COUNCIL OF FOREIGN MINISTERS, remarks in House, Cuba: meeting on, A7332.
- COUNCIL OF FREE NATIONS, establish (see bill H.R. 13344).
Remarks in House: establish, 21285.
- COURT OF CLAIMS.
Communications from
Case of H. W. Nelson Co., Inc. v. The United States, 21495.
- Remarks in House*
Commissioners: bill (H.R. 11036), additional, 20355.
- COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES. See also SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.
Accommodations: remarks in House, bill (S. 3156), provide, 20350.
Administrative Office: letters, retirement of C. Aubrey Casque (sundry), A7560, A7567.
Appropriations: bill making supplemental (see bill H.R. 13290*),
Confessions: article, Inadmissible Confessions, 21545.
Congressional committee records: remarks in House, use in certain litigations, A7414.
Defendants: bill relative to representation of certain (see bill S. 2900*),
Indigent defendants: remarks in Senate, bill (S. 2900), provide representation, 21076.
Judges: bill to amend code relative to bias or prejudice of (see bill S. 2478*),
Killough, James W.: article, Shocking Is the Word, A7469.
Mallory rule: article, Inadmissible Confessions, 21545.
—remarks in Senate, court decision in Killough against the United States, 21337.
Wiretapping: remarks in House, background, 20771.
—remarks in House, proposed legislation, 20771.
—remarks in House, Supreme Court decision of 1928, 20771.
—statements Supreme Court Justices (sundry), 20772.
- COX, CHARLES M., relief (see bill S. 1961*).
Remarks in House, relief.
Remarks in Senate, relief, 21547.
- COX, JAMES A., relief (see bill S. 3785).
- CRAIG, BOB, article, Mississippi, 21663.
- CRAIG SYSTEMS, remarks in House, defense contracts, 21283.
- CRAMER, JOHN, article, Summer Job Plums, 20382.
- CRAMER, WILLIAM C. (a Representative from Florida).
Appointed conferee, 21183, 21303.
Appointed on St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, 22007.
Editorial: Matter of Conscience, from Tampa Tribune, 22218.
Letters: Cuban prisoners (sundry), 22219-22221.
—Effect of Cuban trade embargo on Tampa cigar industry, by Frederick G. Dutton, 21782.
—Exchange of money for Cuban prisoners, by Secretary Dillon, 22242.
—Negotiations for Cuban prisoners, to President Kennedy, by, 21783.
—Negotiations for Cuban prisoners, to Representative Morgan, by, 22241.
Report: Cross-Florida Barge Canal, by Army Engineers, 22197.
Statements: Cuban Situation, by President Kennedy, during 1960 presidential campaign, 22219.
—Paying Ransom to Cuba, by Elpidio Garcia, 21863.
Tables: Cross Florida Barge Canal data, 22197-22201.
Telegram: Paying ransom to Castro, to President Kennedy, by, 21368.
- Amendments offered by, to*
Rivers and harbors and flood control projects: bill (H.R. 13273) authorizing, 20713, 20714.
- Motions and resolutions offered by*
Government copyrights: investigate practices of (see H. Res. 829), 21496.
- CRAMER, WILLIAM C.—Continued
Remarks by, on
Berlin: resolution (H. Con. Res. 570) expressing sense of Congress relative to situation in, 21443.
Betancourt, Romulo, A7702.
Clark Hill Reservoir: bill (S. 1563) to convey lands to Boy Scouts, 21421.
Committee on Public Works: filing of report, 21808.
Copyright laws: abuse of, 21469.
Cross-Florida Barge Canal, 22197.
Cuba: negotiations for release of prisoners, 21782, 21783, 21808, 21865-21868, 22238-22241, A7637.
Cuban prisoners: names of certain, A7667.
District of Columbia: bill (H.R. 12276) making appropriations, 21967.
Federal-Aid Highway Act: bill (H.R. 12135) authorizing appropriations, 21969, 21970.
Federal-aid highways: toll traps, 21466-21469.
Florida: Federal highway program, 21466.
Gambling devices: bill (S. 1658) to prohibit transportation of, 21424.
Highway scandals: legislation to prevent, 21984.
Public works: bill (H.R. 12900) making appropriations, 22154-22156, 22197.
Real property: bill (H.R. 8355) to grant easements, 21734.
Rivers and harbors and flood control projects: bill (H.R. 13273) authorizing, 20682, 20637, 20691-20695, 20704, 20705, 20710-20715, 21789, 22148.
—Senate action on H.R. 13273, 21421.
Venezuela: Communist penetration, A7702.
West Virginia: Federal highway program, 21466-21468.
- CRANDALL, LYNN, statement, Burns Creek project, 20644.
- CRANKSHAW, EDWARD, article, Brezhnev Fails To Win Yugoslavs, A7234.
- CREDIT CARDS. See also INTERSTATE COMMERCE.
Remarks in House: fraudulent use, 20428.
- CREDIT CONTROLS, remarks in House, truth in lending, 20438.
- CRIME, article, Nailing a Lie—Crime Among Spanish-Speaking People in New York, A7536.
- Remarks in House*
Bribery, graft, and conflict of interest: bill (H.R. 8140) to increase penalties, 21130.
Illinois Crime Prevention Bureau, 21593.
CROCKETT, DONALD, article, Returns to Valley, 20330.
- CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL, correspondence relative to, 21139-21142.
Remarks in House: need for, 21139.
- CUBA.
Message to people: Mario Garcia Kohly, A7199.
Proclamation: support of Mario Garcia Kohly and Government-in-exile, by groups of underground fighters, A7198.
Resolution, Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) Junior Chamber of Commerce, A7591.
- Addresses*
Action Needed To Regain Initiative in Western Hemisphere, Representative Selden, 21885.
A Look at Communism in Cuba, George E. Stringfellow, A7697.
- Articles and editorials*
Cold Logic, Not Hot Anger, A7352, A7384, A7434.
Congressional Resolution Called Ineffective, A7263.
Crisis Proves Need of Unity, A7241.
Crossroads: The Corner of Decision and Indecision, A7355.
Cuba: The Record Set Straight, by Charles J. V. Murphy, 20907.
Cuba Can Be Saved, A7629.
Cuban Children Training Set, A7680.
Cuban Freedom Education, A7680.
Cuban Situation (a series), Clare Boothe Luce, A7322, A7326, A7393.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD INDEX

17

CUBA—Continued

Articles and editorials

Economic Sanctions and Blockade Can't End Castro, 20905.

Failure of 1961 Invasion Perils U.S. Global Policies, 20906.

Frank Ramos—Story of a Cuban Refugee, A7478.

Freedom To Act on Cuba, A7218.

Game for Experts, A7311.

Great Britain—Friend in Greed, A7327.

In 1898 and Today, A7450.

Let's Face Reality, A7194.

Lonely Americans, A7459.

Matter of Conscience, 22218.

Modern Day Pacifists, A7336.

Monroe Doctrine—Save It, or Bury It, A7606.

Must U.S. Wait Until We Face Threat of Invasion, A7695.

New Frontier, A7205.

No Ball Game, A7218.

On War Over Cuba, 21648.

Our Allies Have Strong Reasons for Not Embargoing Ships To Cuba, A7329.

Our Friends Aid a Foe, A7484.

Our Friends Are At Sea, A7715.

Plan for Cuba, A7214.

Policy of Doing Nothing, A7207.

President's Ban on Shipping (sundry), 22038, 22039.

Question Is When and How, A7476.

Questions on Cuba, A7621.

Reds Yell Ouch, A7710.

Representative Rogers and Cuban Blockade (sundry), A7705.

Reprisals Tougher Than Expected, 21315.

Rogers Stand Deserves Backing, A7696.

Rosy Red Praise for Soft-on-Cuba Crowd, A7622.

Russian Roulette, A7209.

Russia's Rushing Jet Fighters and Missiles to Cuba, A7602.

Shadow of 1956?, 20774.

Shipments by U.S. Allies (sundry), 21316, 21317.

Story Behind Bay of Pigs Fiasco, A7246.

Support Rogers in Trade Bans (sundry), A7694.

That's Bear You Smell—Russia Now Is Only 360 Miles Away From Stuart, A7443.

They Backed the President, A7626.

Third Choice, 20758.

Unfaced Truth (Clare Boothe Luce), 22077.

United States Cuban Performance Profile in Indecision, by Clare Boothe Luce, 20905, A7275.

U.S. Lifelines Threatened, A7296.

Whiting Willauer: His Cuban Invasion Plan Ended With a Broken Heart, A7510.

Young Cuban Exiles Told About Democracy, A7680.

Letters

Baltimore Woman's Committee for Cuban Freedom, A7679.

Bloc-Cuban trade, to George W. Ball by Representative Kitchin, A7355.

Cuban Rotary Club in Exile asks help for Cuba, A7261.

Foodstuffs for prisoners, Representative Cramer, 21783.

Government-in-exile, Marx Lewis and others, 21306.

Prisoner exchange, Representative Cramer, 21782.

Prisoner-exchange proposal, sundry, 22219.

Ransom of prisoners, David C. Chamberlain, A7687.

Road to war, Rafael L. Diaz-Balart, A7299.

Situation in, Carl D. Stewart, A7424.

Stronger position against, Mrs. Robert Munoz, A7691.

U.S. policies, Assistant Secretary of State F. G. Dutton, 21782.

Remarks in House

Bay of Pigs: President's fateful decision, A7467.

British trade, A7479.

No. XX—3

CUBA—Continued

Remarks in House

Communist aggression: joint resolution (S.J. Res. 230) expressing the determination of the American people, A7290, A7231.

Communist buildup, A7424.

Communist threat, A7702.

Council of Foreign Ministers: meeting on, A7332.

Nations shipping to Cuba: withhold U.S. aid (amendment to H.R. 13175), 21499, 21505.

NATO shipping, 20345, 20403, 21512, A7355.

Norway: halting of shipping, 20403.

Prisoners: Castro blackmail, A7637.

—exchange for foodstuffs, 21782, 21784, 21806, 21865, 21866, 21967, 22014, 22216, 22238.

—names of American citizens, A7667.

Ransom contributions: tax treatment, 22238-22242.

Soviet arms and technicians, 20757, 20766, 21266, 21460, 22241, 22249.

—seven-point program to counter, 21624.

Soviet submarines, 21601.

U.S. action: initiative, A7374.

Remarks in Senate

Castro, Fidel: early support by United States, 21543.

Confiscation of U.S. property, 21071.

Countries trading with Cuba: withhold U.S. aid, 20274, 20280, 20320.

Economic boycott, 20467, 21306.

Fishing port, 21332, 21737.

Government-in-exile, 21306, 21386.

Inter-American military alliance: create, 21385.

Military intervention, 20464, 20467, 21738.

Naval blockade, 21673.

NATO: President's action on shipping, 21737, 22023, 22042, 22170.

NATO countries: shipping, 20285, 20286, 20326, 20453.

Organization of American States: action at Washington meeting, 21384.

—failure to support U.S. position, 20273, 20465, 21664.

Refugees: U.S. aid, 20511, 20538.

Secondary boycott: plan to invoke, 21306, 21315, 21384.

Soviet arms and technicians, 20465, 21351, 21648, 21664, 21677, 21728, 21737.

Trade embargo, 20289.

U.S. policy: reply to critics, 21557-21559.

Statements

Cuban Policy Paralysis Costs, Senator Thurmond, 20287.

Free World Ships in Cuban Trade, Maritime Administration, 21667.

Philosophy of Freedom Program for Cuban Refugee Children, Baltimore Woman's Committee for Cuban Freedom, A7679.

Policy for Cuba, Senator Javits, 20466.

Position of Maritime Trades Department, AFL-CIO, on Ships Carrying Vital Supplies to Cuba, Peter McGavin, A7263.

Reply to President Durazo, by Adlai E. Stevenson, 21649.

Secretary of State Rusk on "News and Comment" television program, A7307.

Trade, George W. Ball, A7385.

U.S. Position (President Kennedy, 1960 campaign), 22219.

Tables

Ships in Cuban trade, by country, 21667.

CULLINAN, RUSTACE, article, Rewarding Career, 21379.

CULOTTA, SAMUEL A., address, Columbus Day, A7565.

CULTURAL ACTIVITIES. See Arrs.

CULTURAL CENTERS. See Arrs.

CUNNINGHAM, GLENN (a Representative from Nebraska).

Letters: Communist propaganda in the mails (exchange of correspondence with the President and the Justice Department), 21672.

CUNNINGHAM, GLENN—Continued

—Communist propaganda uses: U.S. mails, by Vlasta Vraz, A7625.

Tribute in the Senate, 21667.

Petitions and papers presented by, from Societies and associations, 22016.

Remarks by, on

Communist propaganda in the mails, 21411.

Contract mail routes: bill (H.R. 10936) to permit certain extensions, 21817.

Federal Employees Health Benefits Act: bill (H.R. 10539) to amend, 22237.

Golden eagle: resolution (H.J. Res. 489) to protect, 22103.

McCarthy, Robert E., Jr.: delay in trial, 21276.

Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act: bill (H.R. 7927) to enact, 21411.

Summer employment: bill (H.R. 5693) to extend apportionment requirement of Civil Service Act to, 20394.

CURRAN, JOE, article, Tough Talker, A7369.

CURTIN, WILLARD S. (a Representative from Pennsylvania).

Bills and joint resolutions introduced by Woodhouse, William H.: for relief (see bill H.R. 13291), 20444.

CURTIS, CARL T. (a Senator from Nebraska).

Appointed conferee, 21315, 21561, 21747.

Letter: pension plans to provide medical and other benefits for retired employees, by Stanley S. Surrey, 21375.

Amendments offered by, to

Corkboard insulation and cork stoppers: bill (H.R. 12213) to provide suspension of duties, 21369.

Pension plans: bill (H.R. 10117) to permit employers to provide benefits for accident and health expenses to retired employees, 21374, 21375.

Bills and joint resolutions introduced by Rotofanousi, Miss Markala P.: for relief (see bill S. 3792), 21290.

Remarks by, on

Corkboard insulation and cork stoppers: bill (H.R. 12213) to provide suspension of duties, 21369.

Federal-Aid Highway Act: bill (H.R. 12135) authorizing appropriations, 21023.

Foreign aid: bill (H.R. 13175) making appropriations, 20285.

—Cuba, 20285.

Foreign policy: American prestige, 21313.

Pension plans: bill (H.R. 10117) to permit employers to provide benefits for accident and health expenses to retired employees, 21374, 21375.

—Bunker fuel and coastwise commerce, 21375.

Reserve Officers Association: 40th anniversary, 20508.

CURTIS, LAURENCE (a Representative from Massachusetts).

Tributes in the House, 21433, 21994-21998.

Remarks by, on

Berlin: resolution (H. Con. Res. 570) expressing sense of Congress relative to situation in, 21432, 21443.

CURTIS, THOMAS B. (a Representative from Missouri).

Address: Debt Management and Capital Markets, by Robert V. Roosa, before Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 21627.

—Economic Setting for Manpower Training and Development Program, by Ewan Clague, before conference on Manpower Development and Training Act, 21985.

—European Economics, by Richard Amberg, A7586.

—Manless Job and Jobless Man, before International Union of Electrical, Radio, & Machine Workers, by, 22229.

—Some Reflections on Employment Act, by Arthur F. Burns, 21475.

Article: Aged Get Better Insurance, from Business Week, A7297.